



MACKENZIE VALLEY ENVIRONMENTAL

IMPACT AND REVIEW BOARD

EA14314-01: Jay Project,

Dominion Diamond

Public Hearing

Mackenzie Valley Review Panel:

Chairperson	Joanne Deneron
Board Member	Kirby Marshall
Board Member	Yvonne Doolittle
Board Member	James Wah-Shee
Board Member	Bertha Norwegian
Board Member	John Curran

HELD AT:

Yellowknife, NT

September 16, 2015

1 APPEARANCES

2	Chuck Hubert) MVEIRB Staff
3	Mark Cliffe-Phillips)
4	Sachi De Souza)
5	Simon Toogood)
6	Ruari Carthew)
7	Chris Rose)
8	Brett Wheler)
9	Stacey Menzies)
10	Kate Mansfield)
11	Catherine McManus)
12	Alan Ehrlich)
13	Kathy Racher) Technical Advisor
14	Neil Hutchinson) Technical Advisor
15	Anne Gunn) Technical Advisor
16	John Donihee) Counsel
17		
18	Brendan Bell) Dominion Diamond
19	Elliot Holland)
20	Gaeleen MacPherson)
21	Richard Bargery)
22	Claudine Lee)
23	Bob Overvold)
24	Harry O'Keefe)
25	Dustin Chaffee)

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)	
2	Laura Worsley-Brown)
3	Lukus Nory)
4	Nicole Spencer)
5	Charles Klengenberg)
6	Lynn Boettger)
7	Emily Nichol)
8	Tom Jeffery)
9	Ellie Adjun)
10	Laura Corey)
11	Laura Malone)
12	Patrick Duffy) Counsel
13	Kristine Mason) Dominion Consultants
14	Steven Strawon) Golder Associates
15	John Virgil (np))
16	Jim Rettie (np))
17	Fiona Esford)
18	John Faithful)
19	Dennis Chang (np))
20	Cam Stevens)
21	Mike Herrell)
22	Eric Denholm) EDenholm Consulting
23		
24	Lorraine Seale) GNWT
25	Deborah Archibald (np))

1	APPEARANCES (cont'd)		
2	Lisa Dyer	(np)) GNWT
3	Aileen Stevens	(np))
4	Lisa Cardinal	(np))
5	Glen MacKay	(np))
6	Les Harrison	(np))
7	Andy Bevan	(np))
8	Jim Sparling	(np))
9	Melissa Pink)
10	Monica Wendt	(np))
11	Kate Witherly)
12	Dianna Beck)
13	Zachary Young	(np))
14	Rebecca Dupuis	(np))
15	Wade Blake	(np))
16	Shirley Kemeys-Jones	(np))
17	Jesse Davidson	(np))
18	Eric Binion	(np))
19	Ben Linaker	(np))
20	Catherine Braun-Rodriguez	(np))
21	Andrew Hawton	(np))
22	Wade Carpenter	(np))
23	Katherine Villeneuve	(np))
24	Kelly Fisher	(np))
25	Marty Sanderson	(np))

1	APPEARANCES (cont'd)		
2	Peter Fast)	GNWT
3	Francis Jackson (np))	
4	Kelly Mahoney (np))	
5	Jeremy Roberts (np))	
6	Andrea Patenaude)	
7	Nancy Zimmerman (np))	
8	Karin Clark (np))	
9	Dean Cluff (np))	
10	Bruno Croft (np))	
11	Paul Mercredi (np))	
12	Jody Pellissy (np))	
13	Jan Adamczewski (np))	
14	Barry Zajdlik)	Zajdlik Consulting
15	Rick Walbourne)	
16	Bill Pain)	
17	Neil Van Der Gugten)	AMEC
18	Jamie Vangulck)	Arktis
19	Paul Green)	ENR
20	Robert Jenkins)	ENR
21	Lynda Yonge (np))	ENR
22	Brett Elkin (np))	ENR
23	Nathen Richea)	ENR
24	Mike Reddy)	Counsel
25	Simone Tielesh)	Counsel

1 APPEARANCES (cont'd)

2	Peter Unger)	Lutsel K'e Dene
3	Berna Catholique)	First Nation
4	Roger Catholique)	
5	Brian Sanderson)	
6	August Enzoë)	
7	Ron Fatt)	
8			
9	Julie Deault)	Fisheries & Oceans
10	Veronique D'Amours-Gauthier)	Canada
11	Julie Marentette)	
12	Mark D'Aguiar)	
13	Georgina Williston)	
14			
15	Sarah-Lacey McMillian)	Environment Canada
16	Meagan Tobin)	
17	J.F. Dufour)	
18	Bradley Summerfield)	
19	Loretta Ransom)	
20	Anne Wilson		
21			
22	Marjorie Matheson-Maund)	Tlicho Government
23	Grace MacKenzie)	
24	Sjoerd Van Der Wielen	(np))
25	Petter Jacobsen	(np))

	APPEARANCES	(cont'd)	
1			
2	Henry Zoe)	Tlicho Government
3	Joseph Judas)	
4	John B. Zoe	(np))
5	Joseph Judas)	
6	John B. Zoe)	
7			
8	Emery Paquin)	IEMA
9	Jaida Ohokannoak	(np))
10	Kevin O'Reilly)	
11	Bill Rose)	
12	Kim Poole	(np))
13	Doug Doan	(np))
14	Tee Lim)	
15	Tim Byers)	
16			
17	Chief Edward Sangris)	YKDFN
18	Alex Power)	
19	Randy Freeman)	
20			
21	Marc d'Entremont)	DKFN
22	Patrick Simon)	
23	Elmar Plate (by phone))	
24			
25			

1 APPEARANCES (cont'd)

2

3 Shin Shiga)North Slave Metis

4 Elder Ed Jones (np))Alliance

5 Tony Whitford (np))

6 Robert Mercredi (np))

7

8 Shawn McKay (By phone))For Resolution Metis

9)Council

10

11 Gord MacDonald) Diavik Diamond

12) Mines Inc.

13

14 Christopher Aguire)Transport Canada

15 Anita Gudmundson)

16

17 Noeline Villebrun Tthestonotine Society

18 Shin Shiga Member of the Public

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		Page No.
3	List of Undertakings	11
4		
5	Discussion	13
6		
7	PRESENTATIONS re AQUATICS	
8	Presentation by Dominion Diamond	16
9	Question Period	45
10		
11	Presentation by IEMA	160
12	Question Period	173
13		
14	Presentation by GNWT	202
15	Question Period	215
16		
17	Public Commentary	244
18		
19	Presentation by LKDFN	255
20	Question Period	259
21		
22	Presentation by Environment Canada	265
23	Question Period	268
24		
25		

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)	
2		Page No.
3	Presentation by Fisheries & Oceans	285
4	Question Period	295
5		
6	Presentation by YKDFN	312
7	Question Period	318
8		
9	Presentation by DKFN	321
10	Question Period	329
11		
12	Presentation by Transport Canada	334
13	Question Period	337
14		
15	Certificate of Transcript	344
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	LIST OF UNDERTAKINGS	
25	NO.	PAGE NO.
	DESCRIPTION	

1	11	Dominion Diamond will undertake to	
2		provide the results of the recent	
3		supplemental sediment sampling to the	
4		Review Board by October 9, 2015	39
5	12	Dominion Diamond to provide how	
6		much more time would be required	
7		under the lower bound scenario for	
8		the Misery Pit to fill	62
9	13	Dominion Diamond to explain how	
10		additive synergistic or antagonistic	
11		effects of multiple contaminants were	
12		addressed with respect to similar and	
13		different modes of toxic action,	
14		including modifying factors	67
15	14	Dominion Diamond will look at what's	
16		happened with reference to fish	
17		populations before and after the	
18		creation of these meromictic lakes and	
19		the pits that Mr. Unger mentioned	87

20

21

22

23

24

25

LIST OF UNDERTAKINGS

1	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
2	15	Environment Canada will approach	
3		their wildlife toxicology expert and	
4		ask him, based on the water quality	
5		estimates we have for Misery and Jay,	
6		whether he anticipated any issues	
7		with harm to wildlife because the	
8		Migratory Birds Convention Act	
9		speaks specifically to harm	272
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 --- Upon commencing at 8:46 a.m.

2

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good morning,
4 everyone. If we could have everyone take their seat
5 so we could begin?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good morning. My
10 name is Joanne Deneron, and I'm the Chair of the
11 Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board.
12 Welcome to day 3 of the public hearing for the Jay
13 Project.

14 Before we begin, I'd like to
15 acknowledge that we're holding this hearing in the
16 traditional territory of the Yellowknives Dene, and I
17 would ask that we all stand for August Enzoe, our
18 Elder from Lutsel K'e, to say the opening prayer.

19 ELDER AUGUST ENZOE: Thank you very
20 much. Good morning, everybody. So I'm going to --
21 opening prayer for -- to have a good meeting the last
22 day today, so.

23

24 (OPENING PRAYER)

25

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Just an information
2 item. You have your trans -- translation devices
3 here. And on channel 2 we have English. Channel 4 we
4 have Chipewyan. And channel 5, we have Tlicho and
5 Weledeh.

6 Again, another reminder is I would ask
7 everyone to respect the time requirements of other
8 parties during the presentations and questioning and
9 to use their time productively. Keeping to your
10 allotted time is important to make sure that everyone
11 gets their fair chance to be heard.

12 We're starting day 3. And we're going
13 into the aquatics. We have several presentations in
14 front of us. I would ask if the Review Board has any
15 new members or staff to their table this morning.

16 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Mark
17 Cliffe-Phillips, with the Review Board. Yes, we have
18 two (2) of our technical advisors joining us today at
19 the table. We have Dr. -- keep the mic on -- Dr.
20 Kathy Racher and Dr. Neil Hutchinson.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dominion, do you
22 have any new staff to your table this morning?

23 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Thank you, Madam
24 Chair, and good morning, everyone. It seems like it
25 wasn't that long ago I -- we saw you. We have Cam

1 Stevens with Golder Associates at the end, Mike
2 Herrell with Golder Associates, John Faithful with
3 Golder Associates, and at the end of the table, Eric
4 Denholm with EDenholm Consulting.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you -- thank
6 you. I would introduce the Board, but like Rick said,
7 We just saw each other. We -- not too long ago.
8 We're all the same. Okay, I will now ask Dominion for
9 their presentation, please.

10 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Thank you, Madam
11 Chair. It's Richard Bargery, Dominion Diamond. Just
12 a -- just a few words before I turn it over to John
13 Faithful and our team to -- to get into the technical
14 presentation.

15 Similar to other value components and
16 some of the discussions we've had over the last couple
17 days for aquatics, we've also done, you know,
18 extensive engagement over the course of this process,
19 both at the -- within -- in communities and with --
20 with the parties, particularly with the -- the
21 Government of the Northwest Territories on some of the
22 modelling work we've done.

23 We've done, as Mike Herrell will
24 describe, some fairly extensive modelling of -- of the
25 water. We think we again have designed the -- the

1 project in a very responsible way environmentally.
2 And we look forward to answering questions on -- on
3 aquatics over the course of the morning, and then
4 listening to the presentations of -- of the other
5 parties, I guess, later this morning and -- and this
6 afternoon.

7 But with that said, I'll turn it over
8 to -- to John Faithful to -- to start our presentation
9 -- our technical presentation.

10

11 PRESENTATION re AQUATICS

12 Presentation by Dominion Diamond:

13 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: Thanks, Rick.

14 Good morning, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone.
15 As Rick introduced me, I'm John Faithful. I'm with
16 Golder Associates. Presenting with me today on the
17 aquatics components of the Jay Project, which will
18 focus on water quality and fish and fish habitat, are
19 Mike Herrell and Cam Stevens.

20 In addition to providing a summary of
21 the responses by Dominion Diamond to the parties'
22 technical report recommendations, we will also provide
23 an overview of all of the water quality modelling work
24 that has been undertaken since the submission of the
25 Developer's Assessment Report, or DAR. This work --

1 this work has been completed to address the parties'
2 concerns related to water quality during the
3 environmental assessment review process.

4 To begin, I would like to speak to the
5 application of traditional knowledge in the aquatics
6 component. For the Jar -- for the Jay Project, the
7 effects assessment for water quality and fish valued
8 components were assessed using an ecologically
9 relevant and conservative approach, which also
10 integrated traditional knowledge.

11 Traditional knowledge was used to
12 inform the importance of water quality, and fish and
13 fish habitat in the aquatics assessment. Dominion
14 Diamond has and will continue to engage with
15 communities on opportunities to build upon the
16 integration of traditional knowledge into the project
17 during all phases of the project.

18 I'm now going to pass over to Mike.

19 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: Good morning,
20 Madam Chair. I'm Mike Herrell, of Golder Associates.

21 I'm going to discuss the supplemental
22 water quality monitoring work that has been undertaken
23 since submission of the DAR.

24 Within the DAR, a comprehensive water
25 quality model was developed to evaluate the impacts of

1 the Jay Project on surface water quality in Lac du
2 Sauvage and Lac de Gras. Water quality predictions
3 were made for each project's site flow and transfer,
4 and discharge to the receiving environment during
5 operations, closure, and during post-closure.

6 For context, the influence of the
7 discharges on the downstream receiving environment was
8 assessed in Lac du Sauvage and in Lac de Gras at
9 specific locations shown here by red boxes.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me, would you
11 slow down for the translators so they could keep up?
12 Thank you.

13 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: Yes, I will.

14 The tables on this slide and the next
15 slide provide a list of all the supplemental modelling
16 work that has been completed since submission of the
17 DAR. Please note it is my intent to keep the
18 technical terminology in this presentation to a
19 minimum. We have tried to use plain language where
20 possible, but there will be some scientific terms
21 used. I hope this assists the translators and those
22 that may not deal with this subject matter on a day-
23 to-day basis.

24 Firstly, the updated assessment case.
25 This was completed to include the most recent version

1 of Diavik's Mine Water Management Plan that became
2 available after the DAR was submitted. This model
3 also included updates to the Pitt Lake (phonetic)
4 hydrodynamic model assumptions.

5 The reasonable estimate case was
6 completed to provide a less conservative estimate of
7 water quality associated with various sources from the
8 project. The last two (2) modelling tasks on this
9 list, the 2-dimensional Monte Carlo model and the 3-
10 dimensional first order approximation model, were the
11 result of discussions with GNWT and their consultants
12 following the technical sessions in April.

13 These are comprehensive models which
14 were used to assign a probability to each of the
15 groundwater model scenarios assessed in the site water
16 quality model.

17 The next four (4) models were focussed
18 on pit water quality. The lower bound case was
19 developed due to the Review Board expressing their
20 concern during the technical sessions that the EA
21 conservative case may have been too conservative
22 regarding predicted total dissolved solids, or TDS,
23 concentrations in the pits.

24 Under the conservative case, meromixis
25 was predicted to form in the pits and remain stable.

1 To evaluate if meromixis would form for lower TDS
2 concentrations. the lower bound case was developed.

3 The additional pumping model case
4 during the initial dewatering period and the dry year
5 water quality modelling case were sensitivity runs
6 completed at the request of the Review Board to
7 determine if assumptions around these cases would have
8 an influence on Misery Pit discharge water quality
9 during operations.

10 Finally, an extreme wind scenario over
11 the pits was also developed at the request of the
12 Board to test meromixis stability. All of this
13 comprehensive supplemental modelling supported the --
14 and confirmed the conclusions in the DAR. That is,
15 the water management strategy developed for the
16 project will result in meromixis in both the Jay and
17 Misery Pits, permanently isolating mine water from
18 interacting with Lac du Sauvage and Lac de Gras during
19 post-closure. And mining of the Jay Pit -- Jay
20 Project will not result in significant adverse effects
21 to surface water quality in Lac du Sauvage or Lac de
22 Gras during operations and post-closure.

23 The charts on this slide show the
24 results of the 2D Monte Carlo analysis. The 2D Monte
25 Carlo modelling focussed on the enhanced permeability

1 zone in the Jay Pit. That is, the pit inflow quality
2 and quantity are a function of the fracture zones
3 associated with the pit.

4 The charts shown here provide the
5 modelled cumulative probability of groundwater inflows
6 and mass occurring for the set of variable inputs.
7 The 'Y' axes represent the cumulative probability, and
8 the 'X' axes represent the total inflow and mass
9 respectively. The green, yellow, and blue vertical
10 lines represent the total inflow and mass for the
11 lower bound scenario, reasonable estimate case, and
12 the EA conservative case predictions.

13 The intercept of the vertical lines
14 with the cumulative probability curves represent the
15 percentile for that scenario. A comparison of the
16 deterministic model values to the cumulative
17 probability indicates the following. The EA
18 conservative case represents a reasonable upper bound
19 scenario and the lower bound scenario represents a
20 reasonable lower bound for the project.

21 Since groundwater stored in the bedrock
22 will also drain towards the Jay Pit, inputs to the 3-
23 dimensional model were varied to approximate
24 probabilities for groundwater inflow quantity and
25 quality to account for this additional factor. From

1 the table shown on this fli -- slide, the results were
2 similar to the 2-dimensional Monte Carlo model.
3 Dominion Diamond is therefore confident that the full
4 range of groundwater inflow quantity and quality that
5 is expected to occur at the Jay Project has been
6 modelled and considered for assessing impacts to
7 surface water quality for the Jay Project.

8 To put the lower bound scenario into
9 context, the results were carried forward into the
10 site water quality model to evaluate the Misery Pit
11 discharge water quality during operation. The results
12 are shown here on the figure. The Y-axis shows TDS
13 concentrations, and the X-axis represents the
14 operational mine year.

15 Two (2) trends are apparent on the
16 figure. The TDS concentrations are considerably less
17 in the lower bound scenario in comparison to the EA
18 conservative case, and the reasonable estimate case.
19 And for the lower bound scenario, operational
20 discharge from the Misery Pit to Lac du Sauvage is not
21 required until the last year of operations.

22 Taking these modelling outcomes
23 further, the results of the lower bound scenario and
24 the reasonable estimate case modelling were carried
25 forward to the hydrodynamic Misery and Jay Pit models

1 to determine if meromixis would still form under these
2 changed conditions. The X-axis on -- on this figure
3 represents the total dissolved solids concentrations,
4 and the Y-axis provides the depth below the water
5 surface. The solid lines represent the lower bound
6 scenario results, and the reasonable estimate case
7 results are represented by dashed lines.

8 For each time period assessed, there is
9 a consistent lower TDS concentration in the upper pit
10 layer, and a higher TDS concentration in the lower
11 layers. This indicates meromixis will form in the
12 Misery and Jay Pits following back flooding, and
13 remain stable over the two hundred (200) year
14 modelling time frame for both modelling scenarios,
15 including the lower bound scenario.

16 A key component of the supplemental
17 modelling has been to address concerns related to the
18 likelihood of meromixis to form in the Misery and Jay
19 Pits at closure. Based on this comprehensive
20 modelling work that has been completed as part of the
21 DAR, and during the review stage of the project,
22 Dominion Diamond is confident that they have bracketed
23 the range of conditions that will occur during
24 operations.

25 Under all scenarios modelled, including

1 a lower bound scenario and an extreme wind scenario,
2 which is not considered to represent a realistic
3 scenario for the project, meromixis in the Jay and
4 Misery Pits is predicted to develop and remain stable.

5 Madam Chair, now we will transition to
6 discussing the parties' recommendations. Firstly,
7 there was a recommendation from GNWT regarding an
8 alternative discharge period for Misery pit to Lac du
9 Sauvage. Dominion Diamond disagrees with this
10 recommendation on the basis that the delayed
11 discharge, based on the EA conservative case, avoids
12 concurrent Diavik mine discharges. It also provides a
13 longer period of time to collect operational pit
14 monitoring data, which allows greater time for water
15 quality verification, and time to identify and allow
16 adaptive management adjustments to be made if
17 necessary.

18 There were recommendations from
19 Environment Canada and GNWT related to Misery Pit
20 water quality, particularly in the closure period.
21 Dominion Diamond has demonstrated that varying the
22 depth of the freshwater cap in the Misery Pit for
23 closure would be an effective contingency measure, and
24 may be the most effective mitigation on the closure
25 concentrations of water quality constituents.

1 Site-specific water quality and other
2 environmental data in Misery Pit gathered over the ten
3 (10) year mine life of the project will be used to
4 update water quality predictions, and determine the
5 optimal depth of the freshwater cap. The optimal
6 depth may be greater or less than the 60 metres that
7 has been identified through modelling completed to
8 date.

9 This work can only be conducted once
10 operational monitoring data is available. Therefore,
11 Dominion Diamond plans to undertake this optimization
12 study for the Ekati mine Final Closure and Reclamation
13 Plan for approval by the Wek'eezhii Land and Water
14 Board.

15 There was a recommendation from GNWT
16 that MVEIRB include a measure in their decision report
17 that Dominion Diamond undertake an optimization study
18 during operations regarding the storage of fine PK in
19 the Panda and Koala pits. Dominion Diamond is
20 committed to undertaking this optimization study
21 during a future permitting process, prior to
22 kimberlite deposition.

23 Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation and Deninu
24 Kue First Nation recommended the establishment of an
25 independent panel for meromixis. Dominion Diamond

1 does not believe that such a panel is necessary for
2 the following reasons: Dominion Diamond has addressed
3 the issue of the establishment of meromixis in the
4 Misery and Jay Pits at great lengths through the
5 Environmental Assessment review process, and has
6 continued to provide evidence under a variety of
7 modelling scenarios that support the DAR conclusions.

8 Dominion Diamond also recognized that
9 this component of the Water Management Plan will be
10 reviewed further through the permitting process. This
11 process allows the Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board,
12 and the parties, and their technical consultants to
13 further review the closure plan.

14 Dominion Diamond believe that the
15 Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board process of the
16 Management Plan and review is the appropriate
17 regulatory review mechanism to meet the intent of this
18 recommendation.

19 I'm now going to pass the presentation
20 back to John.

21 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: Thanks, Mike.
22 Madam Chair, John Faithful, of Golder Associates.

23 Diavik Diamond Mine provided a
24 recommendation to Dominion Diamond regarding a
25 commitment to advancing monitoring and mitigation for

1 review and acceptance by the Wek'eezhii Land and Water
2 Board and parties to the EA.

3 Dominion Diamond has engaged with
4 Diavik Diamond Mine during the Environmental
5 Assessment review process to discuss potential effects
6 from the Jay Project on water quality in Lac de Gras.
7 Dominion Diamond is committed to continue to engage
8 with Diavik mine on the development of mutually
9 acceptable environmental monitoring plans for water
10 and wildlife where there is spacial overlap of
11 interests or needs.

12 Environment Canada -- Canada
13 recommended that Lac du Sauvage remained oligotrophic
14 during the project and that an appropriate benchmark
15 for monitoring be set to indicate this trophic level
16 condition. Dominion Diamond accepts this
17 recommendation.

18 GNWT recommended that the Review Board
19 include a measure that the Jay Project minimizes
20 impacts at the local scales to the extent possible.
21 Dominion Diamond does not agree that such a measure is
22 required. Dominion Diamond presented a DAR that was
23 comprehensive, which has been supported by a
24 substantial amount of follow-up work through the
25 Environmental Assessment review process.

1 The DAR and its supplemental modelling
2 included various levels of local and larger scale
3 assessments ranging from evaluated -- evaluating
4 changes to water quality in the mixing zone of the
5 Misery Pit discharge to Lac du Sauvage through to the
6 outlet of Lac de Gras and into the Stephanie Lake
7 (phonetic).

8 Dominion Diamond has also committed to
9 undertaking comprehensive operational and closure
10 monitoring programs within the mine footprint and in
11 the receiving environment. Recommendations from the
12 agency, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation, and Yellowknives
13 Dene First Nation requested the preparation and
14 submission of management plans associated with water
15 management and with the waste rock storage area
16 through the permitting process.

17 Dominion Diamond accepts these
18 recommendations. The agency and Lutsel K'e Dene First
19 Nation made recommendations regarding the management
20 of lake sediments contaminated with mercury and their
21 deposition in the waste rock storage area.

22 Dominion Diamond is of the opinion that
23 mercury is not anticipated to be a water quality issue
24 in the receiving environment, either as a result of
25 the construction of the waste rock storage area, the

1 construction of the diked area, or from seepage during
2 the construction and operation of the waste rock
3 storage area.

4 As described by Elliott Holland in
5 Dominion Diamond's day 1 presentation, Dominion
6 Diamond commits to providing details regarding the
7 design, construction, and operational activities
8 associated with the Jay waste rock storage area with a
9 -- within a detailed design report for the waste rock
10 storage area, and an updated version -- version of the
11 Ekati Waste Rock and Ore Storage Management Plan.

12 This detail will include information
13 regarding the handling and storage of overburden,
14 which includes lake sediment, monitoring and
15 evaluation associated with the waste rock storage area
16 use, and adaptive management processes. This version
17 of the Plan will be addressed during the water licence
18 and land use permit -- permitting process.

19 A recommendation was made by the agency
20 regarding consideration of the ongoing use of Counts
21 Lake as a reference lake for the Ekati mine, AEMP.
22 Dominion Diamond commits to an ongoing evaluation of
23 Counts Lake as a reference lake for the Ekati mine
24 operation during the Jay Project operation.

25 Recommendations were presented from the

1 agency and Deninu Kue First Nation regarding toxicity
2 testing of mine water discharge from the project.
3 Dominion Diamond commits to not discharging mine water
4 that is acutely toxic. To meet this commitment,
5 monitoring of mine water in the Misery Pit as an
6 anticipated requirement under its water licence will
7 be undertaken during operations.

8 This monitoring will include chemical
9 analysis and acute and chron -- chronic toxicity
10 testing, which is expected to be similar to the
11 toxicity testing suite and requirements required under
12 the Ekati mine operation. Further detail on the
13 testing requirements from a site and receiving
14 environment perspective will occur as part of the
15 water licence permitting process.

16 The agency made a recommendation
17 regarding the assessment of taxonomic change in
18 plankton during the operation of the project.
19 Dominion Diamond is developing an AEMP, or an aquatics
20 effect monitoring plan, that will include monitoring
21 phytoplankton and zooplankton species composition,
22 abundance, and biomass. This monitoring is expected
23 to be consistent with that undertaken for the Ekati
24 mine operation under its AEMP. Further detail on the
25 testing requirements from a site and receiving

1 perspective will occur as part of the water licence
2 permitting process.

3 Now I'll pass on to Cam.

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MR. CAM STEVENS: Madam Chair, this
8 Cam Stevens of Golder Associates. The agency
9 presented a recommendation to model wave turbulence in
10 areas of Lac du Sauvage within close proximity to
11 project activities that may be affected by dust
12 deposition.

13 Dominion Diamond does not agree with
14 this recommendation. As stated in the DAR and in
15 replies to the agency's Information Requests during IR
16 Rounds I and II, Dominion Diamond reiterates that the
17 accumulation of dust at nearby shoals is projected to
18 be non-measurable, and as a result, would have no
19 effect to water quality or on the suitability or
20 productivity of fish habitat.

21 Physical processes in the lake related
22 to wave action, lake currents, and the large volume of
23 water in the lake will be maintained. These processes
24 will disperse dust to depositional areas in the lake,
25 and limit any accumulation on erosional areas such as

1 spawning shoal habitat in the lake. This view is
2 supported by the literature and various studies at
3 Diavik and Ekati mines.

4 DFO presented recommendations related
5 to the management of blasting activities. Dominion
6 Diamond commits to develop a blasting plan for the
7 project which will include a monitoring and mitigation
8 component and will engage with DFO as appropriate in
9 the development of the plan.

10 DFO presented several recommendations
11 related to stream crossings in minimizing the
12 potential for fish barriers to develop. Dominion
13 Diamond commits to these recommendations.

14 DFO presented a recommendation to
15 implement best management practices in the design of
16 the Sub-Basin B Diversion Channel. Dominion Diamond
17 is committed to an appropriate channel design to
18 mitigate serious harm to fish and will continue to
19 engage with DFO and Aboriginal parties on the design
20 of the channel.

21 Dominion Diamond is also committed to
22 operational monitoring -- monitoring of fish use of the
23 Sub-Basin B Diversion Channel to confirm its -- its
24 expected functions, for example, as a migratory
25 corridor for fish.

1 Madam Chair, related again to the Sub-
2 Basin B Diversion Channel, DFO presented several
3 further recommendation. Dominion Diamond commits to
4 these recommendations. For example, Dominion Diamond
5 will provide the detailed design plans to DFO for
6 review during the regulatory phase of the project.

7 DFO presented several recommendations
8 for mitigating potential effects to fish habitat at
9 the narrows, at Lake C1 and Stream C1. Dominion
10 Diamond commits to these recommendations. Dominion
11 Diamond will include hydrology monitoring of Lake C1,
12 Stream C1, and the narrows in the final design of the
13 Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program, the AEMP.

14 In addition, the response framework
15 within the AEMP will include early warning action
16 levels for hydrologic changes that require management
17 actions to prevent adverse effects to fish.
18 Regulators, such as DFO and communities, will continue
19 to be engaged in the design of the AEMP during the
20 water licence process, including the development of
21 any future response plans as needed.

22 DFO presented several recommendations
23 regarding the Conceptual Fish-out and Offsetting Plan.
24 Dominion Diamond commits to these recommendations.
25 Dominion Diamond will continue to engage DFO and

1 communities on the development of the fish-out plan,
2 including details related to the handling and fate
3 fish from the fish-out and on the development of the
4 offsetting plan for the project.

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 MR. CAM STEVENS: Environment Canada
9 recommended that the effects study -- the study area
10 in the Developer's Assessment Report, the DAR, and the
11 proposed sampling program for the AEMP be aligned for
12 fish and fish habitat. Dominion Diamond disagrees
13 that the study area boundaries should be aligned.

14 The environmental assessment and
15 monitoring program have different purposes. For the
16 environmental assessment, the effects study area is
17 intended to capture the maximum spatial extent of
18 potential effects from the project and also capture
19 the predicted spatial extent of cumulative effects
20 from existing and reasonably foreseeable developments
21 in the Lac de Gras watershed.

22 Under these objectives, the effects
23 study area for fish and fish habitat considered the
24 highly mobile behaviour of fish value components as
25 well as the connectivity of the lakes that support the

1 fish species.

2 In contrast to the assessment, the main
3 objective of the AEMP is to collect monitoring data to
4 support protections -- protection of the VCs. This is
5 accomplished by designing the monitoring program to
6 detect early warning changes in measurement
7 indicators.

8 Further engagement on the AEMP with
9 parties and the Land and Water Board will occur during
10 the water licence permitting process. Madam Chair, a
11 substantial amount of work has been conducted for the
12 environmental assessment for this project. The recent
13 completion of eight (8) supplemental modelling and
14 analyse -- analyses tasks increases confidence in the
15 results for the water quality assessment.

16 In summary, Dominion Diamond has agreed
17 or made commitments to the majority of recommendations
18 for water quality and fish provided by the parties.
19 For the aquatics environment, Dominion Diamond is
20 committed to monitoring to support protection of the
21 receiving environment and the valued components.
22 Dominion Diamond has developed a conceptual AEMP
23 design plan, and will further develop the details of
24 this plan through engagement with parties and the
25 Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board under the permitting

1 process. Finally, Dominion Diamond would like to thank
2 the parties for their contributions during the project
3 environmental assessment review process.

4 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
5 Do -- Richard Bargery, Dominion Diamond. That
6 concludes our presentation, Madam Chair.

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your
11 presentation. If we could go into questioning. We'll
12 ask the monitoring agency.

13

14 QUESTION PERIOD:

15 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin, with
16 the monitoring agency. If we could have slide 21 put
17 up please.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Thank you. In the
22 last bullet of this slide, Dominion Diamond states
23 that it has undertaken supplementals -- supplemental
24 sediment sampling in the proposed dike area, in order
25 to verify the reported -- the previously reported

1 sediment mercury concentrations.

2 Have the results of this supplemental
3 sampling been received by Dominion? And if so, can
4 these results now be provided to the Board?

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
9 Dominion Diamond. So I guess our -- our preference
10 would have been for the results to be available for
11 this -- for this time. But the weather was -- was not
12 overly favourable in the last -- the last few weeks.
13 So the -- the sampling actually just occurred last
14 week, and once the results are -- are available
15 they'll be made -- made available. But it'll be a
16 little while yet.

17 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: When you say 'it'll
18 be a little while', can you be a little bit more
19 specific? When do you expect the results? And can
20 they sub -- be submitted to the Board once -- once
21 they have been received by the Company? And this was
22 Emery Paquin.

23 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
24 Dominion Diamond. Thanks, Emery. A little bit out of
25 our control, but we can certainly, we think, meet the

1 -- meet the undertaking period. So we can have them
2 before the end of the undertaking period, so before
3 October 9th.

4 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin, with
5 the monitoring agency. So are you saying that this
6 will be a formal undertaking?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
11 Dominion Diamond. I just want to make sure I get the
12 wording right, because it -- it is, you know, it --
13 it's a little bit out of our control. Someone else is
14 doing the -- the test results obviously.

15 But we'll undertake -- if -- I'm not
16 sure what the wording will be, but we will -- we will
17 make every effort possible to have the test results
18 available by -- by October 9th. But it is going to be
19 dependent on -- on getting the results back from the
20 lab.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Legal counsel...?

22 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Thank you, Madam
23 Chair. It's John Donihee. We'll record that then as
24 Undertaking number 11.

25

1 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 11: Dominion Diamond will
2 undertake to provide the
3 results of the recent
4 supplemental sediment
5 sampling to the Review
6 Board by October 9, 2015
7

8 MR. TIM BYERS: Continuing on with our
9 line of questioning, Madam Chair. Oh, sorry. Tim
10 Byers, with the monitoring agency. I'll probably make
11 that mistake a few times. First off, if we go to
12 slide number 6. And on the bottom of that slide the
13 Company has reported that they have put together a
14 report on how extreme wind events may or may not
15 disrupt meromixis.

16 And I've looked at your report results,
17 Dominion's results, on that particular study and I
18 notice that they've modelled for below surface
19 turbulence generated by the surface waves created by
20 wind and -- and fetch, fetch being the length of a --
21 a lake.

22 If it's in tandem with the direction of
23 wind that could generate longer waves. I am wondering
24 if, because I -- I didn't see it in those results, did
25 you factor in possible seiche generated by the same

1 wind scenario?

2 And for folks that don't quite know
3 what 'seiche' is, seiche in a lake is created by
4 strong wind and atmospheric pressure. And this can
5 drive surface waves on a lake to the end of that same
6 lake so that the water level increases at that end and
7 then with rebound that wave, if you will, will rebound
8 across the lake again to the opposite sho -- shore, so
9 that it -- the -- the lake want -- wants to maintain
10 an equ -- equilibrium of its surface level.

11 So basically you might say it's almost
12 like in a bathtub where if you put your hand through
13 it'll have that wave sloshing back and forth and that
14 in itself can create mixing below. And I'm wondering
15 if this type of phenomena was looked at in this model.
16 Thank you.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
21 Herrell, of Golder Associates. So the -- the
22 modelling that was completed was done in the
23 hydrodynamic model. So the hydrodynamic model
24 accounts for the -- the wind driven currents within
25 the -- the lake itself and it'll account for those

1 effects inherently within the -- the factor that that
2 model accounts for.

3 So it includes the -- the wind speed
4 and the vertical mixing that can be associated with
5 the -- the wind driven forces.

6 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
7 Dominion Diamond. Just -- just on -- on this, because
8 we -- we went fairly fast through -- through the
9 presentation because there were a lot of issues to
10 address. So just with respect to this scenario
11 itself, this came out of a -- a workshop we -- we had
12 with the GNWT and it was a suggestion from the Board's
13 -- the expert to do this.

14 I call it the Biblical case, because it
15 will never -- never happen, but it -- it is a --
16 something that would -- it -- it's a circumstance we
17 think would never ever happen. It's -- it's really an
18 extreme -- extreme case. So I just wanted to make
19 that point for the Board that what we're talking about
20 here is -- is something that -- that probably is far
21 outside the realm of possibility.

22 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
23 agency. This particular modelling, again, with the
24 idea of a seiche potentially created, I could see
25 where that perhaps might not occur in a small pit lake

1 like Misery, however, Jay at closure will be
2 reconnected again with the larger Lac du Sauvage.

3 And we at the agency are wondering if
4 that particularly long -- long -- much longer fetch of
5 that lake may in fact create winds that -- or sorry,
6 waves over the -- the Jay portion of that lake. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
9 Herrell, of Golder Associates. So the -- the Jay pit
10 following back flooding will be surrounded by a dike
11 that will remain above the surface and the dike
12 elevation will be about 2 metres above the -- the lake
13 surface and it'll only be breached in -- in certain
14 parts.

15 So the -- the fetch of the full lat --
16 length of Lac du Sauvage is irrelevant for generating
17 currents within -- within the -- the diked off area of
18 the -- the Jay pit. So the -- the fetch that was
19 included in the med -- modelling was within the -- the
20 diked off area, because that'll act as a wind barrier
21 for waves that are generated outside of the diked
22 area.

23 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim...

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dominion, do you
2 have a response or more to that? No?

3 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: No, I think -- I
4 think that's fine, Madam Chair.

5 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
6 Agency again. Onto my next question. If we go to
7 slide 19, I have a bit of confusion.

8 You don't -- you state that you don't
9 agree with the -- the measure proposed by NWT yet you
10 seem to have designed a mine water management plan
11 that accomplishes the very thing that NWT is proposing
12 in their measure. So I'm not -- I'm not quite sure
13 why you would be opposed to the measure. I wonder if
14 you could explain, please?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
19 Dominion Diamond. I think that's the point, Tim, that
20 because we've designed it in such a way that it was
21 protective, we don't think we need a measure.

22 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you. Moving
23 onto my next question then, I noticed in a response to
24 NWT-IR-204, DDEC doesn't seem to answer the NWT's
25 question surrounding which species of aquatic life may

1 be harmed sublethally within the mixing zone. And
2 that brings us to the acute toxicity testing that
3 you're committed to.

4 And I am wondering if the appropriate
5 species of cladocera will be used? You're using
6 daphnia quite -- quite correctly, but I would submit
7 to you that your recent AEMPs for the lakes downstream
8 of the current Ekati mine are showing that it's not
9 daphnia that is declining in the zooplankton
10 community, but it is a separate species called
11 Holopedium gibberum. And that particular species I
12 noticed was found in your baseline study in Lac du
13 Sauvage at -- in the summertime 25 percent of the
14 community.

15 So I am wondering if the Company has
16 entertained the possibility of having a secondary
17 cladoceran species along with daphnia be tested for
18 acute toxicity?

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
23 Dominion Diamond. That -- that determination of
24 appropriate testing and species is a part of the
25 development of the Aquatics Effects Monitoring Program

1 Design Plan. And as discussed and in response to
2 parties' recommendations we have already, as part of
3 the engagement, provided a conceptual plan. And
4 further engagement will be completed both with
5 communities, regulatory groups, and the Water Board
6 during that regulatory process.

7 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you. I only
8 have two (2) more questions, if I may? The next
9 question is on --

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: State your name,
11 please.

12 MR. TIM BYERS: Oh, sorry. Tim Byers,
13 Monitoring Agency. On slide 24, your last bullet has
14 said that:

15 "If there are any changes identified
16 in -- in the plankton community,
17 that response plans will be
18 developed within the AEMP response
19 framework as appropriate."

20 I find the -- the phrase, "If changes
21 are identified," is fairly vague. What I would seek
22 is what level of change in that community will
23 necessitate a response. So what are the triggers for
24 community change that will cause the Company to decide
25 that there may need to be some actions taken and what

1 are the lead times for changes occurring between the
2 time sig -- significant changes within that community
3 is identified and actions can be take to reverse any
4 significant adverse impacts to the community?

5 Thank you.

6 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
7 Dominion Diamond. As it says, response plans would be
8 developed as part of the Aquatic Effects Monitoring
9 Program and as a requirement of the water licence. So
10 triggers, lead times, all of those things would be
11 discussed once a design plan is in place and the
12 aquatic response framework is updated to include
13 those.

14 That process if part of the regulatory
15 phase and does have an engagement process and
16 opportunity there for the -- the communities of the --
17 for IEMA and the -- and the regulators to be a part
18 of.

19 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you. And my
20 final question -- final -- sorry, Tim Byers,
21 Monitoring Agency. There seems to be a bit of an
22 inconsistency related to what the Company has stated
23 in regards to the shoals in Lac du Sauvage.

24 In the DAR, specifically page 9-35,
25 they stated that, quote:

1 "Compared to Lac de Gras, shoals in
2 Lac du Sauvage are generally not as
3 numerous and provide less potential
4 spawning habitat of good or fair
5 quality than in Lac de -- Lac de
6 Gras."

7 But this assessment seems to be
8 contradicted in the Company's response to the agency's
9 tech report, page 2-12, when they state that:

10 "Any changes to habitat at the
11 spawning shoals are, therefore,
12 considered to be very small and have
13 no measurable effect to population,
14 the abundance for fish, due to the
15 high availability of suitable
16 spawning habitats in Lac du
17 Sauvage."

18 So there seems to be some uncertainty
19 as to whether Lac du Sauvage is habitat limited for
20 the very species that Aboriginal communities are
21 concerned about, such as trout, such as whitefish.
22 And this will be a serious consideration if it is
23 determined that Lac du Sauvage and Lac de Gras fish
24 populations are in fact isolated, which I've heard
25 from other -- other tech reports allude to.

1 And I don't know if that's -- that's
2 currently or if that's with a perceived drop in the
3 narrows between the two (2) -- water -- water level
4 drop between the two (2) lakes.

5 So I'm wondering if the Company can
6 clarify whether they see Lac du Sauvage as habitat
7 limited for spawning of VC fish. Thank you.

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MR. CAM STEVENS: Madam Chair, Cam
12 Stevens, Golder Associates. To -- it is our
13 understanding there is no change in message or
14 consistency between the DAR and the response. There
15 is different use of terminology, and potentially
16 that's where the confusion lies.

17 But we do maintain that there is an
18 abundance of -- of spawning habitat in the effects
19 study area, most of which would be occurring in Lac de
20 Gras. And we also maintain that the two (2) lakes are
21 well connected and that fish in one (1) lake likely do
22 move into the adjacent lake and that individuals from
23 both sides do breed with one another.

24 And by that definition, Lac du Sauvage
25 and Lac de Gras was treated as one (1) unit in the

1 effects -- as an effects study area.

2 MR. TIM BYERS: Supplementary if I
3 may, Madam Chair. Tim Byers, with the agency.

4 I take your point and I agree with you
5 provided that the water levels withing Lac du --
6 within the narrows do not recede greater than
7 expectation and result in two (2) isolated lakes. If
8 that occurs then it would be most important, I think,
9 for the fish within Lac du Sauvage for us to know if
10 they're going to have a problem in finding enough
11 spawning beds to sustain the population. Thank you.

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. CAM STEVENS: Madam Chair, Cam --
16 Cam Stevens, Golder Associates. Would it be possible
17 to go to slide 30? Are we the controller? We are.
18 Okay.

19 So the response is presented here and I
20 would just like to direct your attention to the second
21 bullet, the AEMP -- the Aquatic Effect Monitoring
22 Program response fram -- framework will include early
23 warning action levels.

24 And these are the action levels that
25 the agency is -- is referring to, to hydro --

1 hydrologic changes that require management actions to
2 prevent further -- prevent adverse affects to fish.
3 These details will be discussed in a -- during
4 engagement with regulators and communities during the
5 water licence process.

6 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: Elliot Holland,
7 for Dominion Diamond. Just to -- to add to that, to -
8 - to be specific, during the -- the back flooding
9 process during closure the rate of -- of back flooding
10 will be -- will be under the -- the control of -- of
11 the project and we can adjust it in response to -- to
12 these concerns so that it -- we -- we don't encounter
13 the situation where -- where we have, you know,
14 greater than a generation for fish species where --
15 where there isn't conductivity.

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
20 agency. Thank you for your responses. We have no
21 further questions, Madam Chair.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
23 Questions Government of the Northwest Territories?

24 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
25 Chair. My name is Nathen Richea. I'm the manager of

1 the water regulatory section with the water resources
2 division with Environment and Natural Resources.

3 We have a variety of questions for
4 Dominion Diamond here today, but we've screened them
5 to the most important ones in consideration of the
6 time that is allotted for the hearing here today.
7 Myself, I'll have a series of questions and also one
8 (1) of our con -- technical consultants, Mr. Barry
9 Zajdlik of Zajdlik and associates will have a few
10 questions as well.

11 So I have a bit of a preamble before I
12 start in my line of questioning and we'll start with
13 Dominion Diamond has responded to Information Requests
14 about water management indicating that they have
15 effectively mitigated strateg -- effective mitigation
16 strategies to address water quality issues and that
17 they will be implementing adaptive management should
18 issues become apparent during operations.

19 They note that deviations from DAR
20 predictions would be a trigger for adaptive management
21 for water storage and effluent discharge. They've
22 also stated that they would not discharge effluent
23 that's acutely toxic. Dominion Diamonds responded to
24 recommendations from the GNW -- the GNWT about water
25 management contingencies on slide 13.

1 So the first question I have for
2 Dominion is: What adaptive management options exist,
3 if effluent is acutely toxic in year ten (10) of the
4 development, and Misery pit is filled with mine water
5 in year five (5)?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Just one (1)
10 second, Madam Chair. We're just trying to find the
11 right -- the right reference.

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: Madam Chair, John
16 Faithful for Golder Associates. I think one (1) of
17 the -- the strong benefits of the -- of the Water
18 Management Plan is the -- the ability to -- to
19 undertake a lot -- operational monitoring within the
20 Misery pit right from the commencement of operations.
21 That provides a great opportunity to be able to -- to
22 monitor water quality and determine whether or not the
23 water quality is tracking towards a -- a condition
24 that would present potential acute toxicity concerns.

25 The DAR environmental assessment

1 conservative case provided a -- provided a real
2 conservative estimate of what -- of TDS
3 concentrations, which are -- which I'll refer to in
4 terms of -- of where the potential for toxicity li --
5 lies. It presented a scenario where -- at -- at year
6 ten (10) we're approaching conditions that could be
7 potentially acutely toxic. That's the EA conservative
8 case. The modelling has also provided an indication
9 of what the overall bound around water quality
10 conditions in Misery pit could potentially be.

11 With that being said, the benefit is
12 the fact that the operational monitoring starts from -
13 - starts from the operation year one (1) of the
14 project, and is in place for a number of years before
15 operational discharge is required.

16 Now, in the event that contingencies
17 need to be considered based on water quality
18 conditions being outside that -- the bounds of which
19 have been carried forward in the assessment, there are
20 a number of -- of contingencies that the -- that
21 Dominion Diamond can consider in -- in dev -- in
22 mitigating any potential further concerns.

23 Now, they've been outlined in -- both
24 in the DAR, and in a number of Information Request
25 responses during this process. Now, I'm struggling to

1 find the location of that list. And I think -- I
2 think -- we actually have them here, so I will -- I
3 will speak to some of these now.

4 The -- I do -- I do refer to IR-Round-1
5 Response to Environment Canada Number 15. The list of
6 contingencies includes the capacity to actually
7 maintain a freeboard in Misery pit over the course of
8 operations. That's a 10-metre contingency which
9 allows for the additional storage of an extra three
10 (3) -- 3 million cubic metres of water.

11 The other alternative is to maintain
12 pumping capacity and a pipeline between the Misery and
13 Link Pits -- Lynx Pits throughout the operations stage
14 to allow for a lowering of the Lynx Pit water level to
15 generate again additional capacity for mine water
16 storage, if it's needed; increasing the storage
17 capacity in the Jay runoff sump and mine inflow sump
18 to augment temporary mine water storage capacity
19 within the diked area during operations; consideration
20 of direct discharge to the environment from the Jay
21 runoff sump if water is found to meet discharge
22 criteria; the use of storage capacity available at the
23 Ekati mine site; or the treatment of parameters of
24 concern prior to discharge to Lac du Sauvage, if
25 necessary.

1 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Madam -- Madam
2 Chair, Richard Bargery, Dominion Diamond. So I just
3 want to make a point here with respect to this -- this
4 recommendation. We haven't precluded discharging from
5 years '03 to '08. That's not what we're saying when
6 we disagree with this recommendation.

7 We're just saying that it shouldn't be
8 a measure, and it shouldn't be decided today. We need
9 -- that oper -- that operational flexibility is -- is
10 a positive part of the -- of the Water Management Plan
11 that -- that we have, and we'd like to maintain that
12 flexibility because we think that that -- that is
13 operationally the -- the best -- the best situation
14 right now. Thank you.

15 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
16 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with ENR. Thank you for
17 the answer.

18 I, too, have seen the list of
19 contingency options that were presented by the
20 Developer. I guess in the event that some of those
21 contingency options were actually implemented, we
22 don't really understand what the implications or
23 potential significance of that would be.

24 For example, in the event that water
25 from Misery was moved to Lynx Pit, that hasn't been

1 included as part of the assessment for -- for this
2 process. But I do have a follow-up question to the
3 response, and that is: What contingency storage would
4 be needed and how much time would be required for the
5 Developer to create that contingency storage, if there
6 was toxicity issue in year ten (10)?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
11 Golder Associates. Year ten (10) of mine operations
12 is -- is right at the back end of the mine operations,
13 and I think that a number of the contingencies that we
14 provided are valid and appropriate. However, the --
15 the key piece -- or the key contingency that we can
16 speak to in this regard for that situation is the --
17 the 10-metre freeboard at the -- at the top of Misery.

18 But in saying that, again I come back
19 to the point that we have a raft of time with respect
20 to the Mine Plan, and the Water Management Plan, to be
21 able to track water quality conditions in the Misery
22 Pit prior to even the commencement of -- of discharge.
23 We are going to know well in advance how things are
24 tracking with -- with some confidence.

25 That also provides a great deal of time

1 to identify, if necessary should water quality
2 conditions change beyond that which has been
3 projected, to undertake adaptive management. And --
4 and that again speaks to -- speaks to the strength
5 around the Water Management Plan, and it also speaks
6 to the commitment Dominion have with respect to -- to
7 protecting the downstream environment.

8 MR. NATHEN RICHA: Thank you, Madam
9 Chair. It's Nathen Richa again, with the GNWT.
10 Thank you for the response. I have one (1) other
11 question on this topic, and it's really just a matter
12 of clarification.

13 I noted in a lot of the information
14 that was provided in the response to questions about
15 water management that adaptive management would only
16 be applied if deviations from DAR predictions were
17 assessed during operations. And I note right now
18 there are a series of DAR predictions. One (1) is the
19 EA conservative case, which includes the effluent that
20 could be acutely toxic in year 10.

21 So I'm wondering if I can get a
22 clarification from the Company on at what point would
23 they apply the adaptive management? Would it be if
24 deviations from the EA conservative case were
25 monitored during project operations? Because that is

1 the issue that we're talking about here. One (1) of
2 the predictions is, in year 10 the effluent could be
3 acutely toxic, and that's part of the DAR assessment.

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
8 Golder Associates. Dominion Diamond are committed to
9 not discharging acutely toxic water. I think we've --
10 we've talked a number of times around the -- the
11 capacity to -- to operationally monitor water quality
12 conditions in the -- in the Misery Pit.

13 Built alongside of that monitoring are
14 going to be thresholds that are going to be built
15 around the -- the conditions to determine whether or
16 not water quality is tracking beyond that EA
17 conservative case and allow the adaptive management to
18 be put in place accordingly.

19 It's not going to be a sense of
20 watching things change, and then making a decision in
21 year 10. It's providing the opportunity, which again
22 is one (1) of the benefits of the water management
23 plan, to allow early warnings to be ad -- to be
24 addressed accordingly.

25 Now, early mor -- warnings don't

1 necessarily mean that things are going to -- to
2 progress to an adverse state, but it allows the
3 Company plenty of time to be able to evaluate the
4 concern and adaptively manage it.

5 MR. NATHEN RICHA: Thank you, Madam
6 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, ENR. I guess I have again
7 the same question because I think I heard in the
8 answer that if the monitoring deviated from the EA
9 conservative case adaptive management would be
10 applied.

11 And I think that's where we have the
12 issue because the EA conservative case shows that
13 there's going to be acute toxicity in year 10.

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
18 Golder Associates. Dominion Diamond reaffirms its --
19 its position on -- on adaptively managing the Misery
20 Pit water quality conditions, so as that -- so as the
21 acutely toxic water will not be discharged to the
22 receiving environment.

23 MR. NATHEN RICHA: Thank you. Madam
24 Chair, it's Nathen Richea, with ENR. I'll move on to
25 a couple other lines here -- I have here.

1 I think I heard in one of the answers
2 to previous questions here from me: Is it possible
3 that Domin -- Dominion Diamonds could discharge
4 effluent sooner than year five (5), from a logistical
5 standpoint?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
10 Golder Associates. We don't preclude that option.
11 However, again I come back to the -- the benefits of -
12 - of the Water Management Plan that they present to --
13 to Dominion and the receiving environment. There --
14 there is a great deal of flexibility associated with
15 the operational monitoring that's provided for for the
16 mine -- for the Misery Pit.

17 What that does is -- I'll come back.
18 We have -- we have provided a fairly substantial set
19 of modelling that has provided us with confidence
20 around what the likely conditions in Misery Pit will
21 be from the EA conservative case down through to the
22 lower bound scenario. So there's -- we can expect
23 with confidence that within those bounds, that's what
24 the water quality conditions are going to be like in
25 Misery Pit.

1 Now, in the event that we -- we rece --
2 we get Misery Pit water quality conditions that allow
3 discharge to be delayed for another year or two (2),
4 and in the -- as in the lower bound case we suggested
5 that -- that discharge would only be required in year
6 ten (10). There lies the benefit of the Plan.

7 It also speaks to Dominion Diamond's
8 commitment to be protective to the receiving
9 environment, and a limit -- and limit to the extent
10 possible the dire -- this direct discharge piece. And
11 so I -- like I -- I initially stated, We -- discharge
12 earlier is not precluded but where -- what we have
13 proposed in terms of the mine plan provides a great
14 deal of flexibility for Dominion Diamond, and speaks
15 to its commitment to downstream receiving environment
16 protection.

17 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you. Madam
18 Chair, I have one (1) final question, and then I'll
19 turn it over to Mr. Barry Zajdlik. My question is
20 actually prefaced by the response. Under the lower
21 bound scenario, how long would the pit walls be
22 exposed to the atmosphere?

23 In response to our proposed water
24 management strategy, one of the reasons, or one of the
25 rationale given for putting water into the pit and

1 filling it sooner, so you say such year five (5), was
2 that the metasediments in the walls would be
3 incorporated in the water sooner, and then that would
4 be less of a risk to the water quality in the future.

5 But under the lower bound scenario, how
6 long -- how much more time would be required for the
7 Misery Pit to fill?

8 MR. RICHARD BARGER: Richard Barger,
9 Dominion Diamond. I -- I don't think we have that
10 sort of available here today. We can -- we can
11 certainly take that as an undertaking, and be happy to
12 provide that. But -- but we don't have it just off
13 the top of our heads, sorry.

14

15 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 12: Dominion Diamond to
16 provide how much more time
17 would be required under
18 the lower bound scenario
19 for the Misery Pit to fill

20

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Legal counsel...?

22 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Thank you, Madam
23 Chair. It's John Donihee. Does GNWT want that
24 information? Do you want the -- are you accepting the
25 undertaking?

1 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you. It's
2 Nathen Richea, with ENR. Yeah, it would be important
3 for us to understand the differences between the two
4 (2) scenarios, and how long the pit walls would be
5 exposed.

6 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: It's John Donihee,
7 for the Board. Thank you, Madam Chair. We'll record
8 that as Undertaking number 12.

9 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: If -- if we
10 could just get a clarification from Dominion on what
11 they understand is -- is the undertaking? Mark Cliff-
12 Phillips, with the Review Board.

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: I think we're
17 going to do a compare -- sorry, Richard Bargery,
18 Dominion Diamond. We'll do a comparison of the length
19 of time the pit walls are open between the
20 conservative case and the lower bound case and the
21 differences between those two (2).

22 Does that -- that -- Nathen's nodding,
23 so I think I've got it right.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, carry on with
25 your questions. Sachi...?

1 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
2 with the Board. Just to clarify something.

3 So we're -- GNWT's request is to ask
4 for the length of time that the walls would be
5 exposed. I think the -- the implication of that
6 actually gets at water quality within the Misery Pit
7 given your -- your preamble about the exposed wall and
8 the rock wa -- rock -- pit wall qual -- rock quality.

9 So with that, I think the ques -- it
10 could be refined to how long it would take to also
11 fill the Misery Pit in that lower bound scenario and
12 where that water's coming from, I'm assuming it would
13 be based on your existing ICRP, and also, what would
14 the water quality in the pit be as a result. So what
15 would the water quality in the pit be in the lower
16 bound scenario at closure once full?

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
21 Dominion Diamond. Sachi, just -- Sachi, just for
22 clarity, water quality when -- as soon as -- when the
23 pit's full, that's -- that's what -- that's what you
24 said, right?

25 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,

1 yes.

2 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
3 Dominion Diamond. Yes, we -- we can -- we can provide
4 that as an undertaking -- as part of the undertaking.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, carry on with
6 questions, Government.

7 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
8 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with ENR. I'd like to
9 pass it over to Mr. Barry Zajdlik, a consultant to the
10 GNWT.

11 MR. BARRY ZAJDLIK: Barry Zajdlik, on
12 behalf of GNWT. I have a single question. The
13 question is: Do the conclusions regarding lack of
14 significant biological effects consider simultaneous
15 exposures to multiple contaminants?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Just -- Richard
20 Bargery, Dominion Diamond. Just give us one (1)
21 second on -- on this particular one. We just want to
22 make sure we get the answer correct.

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
2 Dominion Diamond. It took us a few minutes to say
3 yes.

4 MR. BARRY ZAJDLIK: Barry Zajdlik, on
5 behalf of GNWT. I do have a followup question given
6 that response. So in -- in consideration of the
7 simultaneous effects, how did you look at additive,
8 antagonistic, and synergistic effects of contaminants
9 that have similar and different modes of toxic action?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
14 Dominion Diamond. Given the -- given the complexity
15 of that question, I -- I think it deserves a -- a --
16 sort of a -- a full -- a full answer as opposed to us
17 trying to put one (1) together here. So we need to --
18 I think we need -- and -- and frankly I think we'll
19 need to talk to other people that have been involved
20 in -- in the work here.

21 So we'll commit, as Undertaking Number
22 -- I'm not sure what this is, John -- but as an
23 undertaking to provide a -- a fulsome response to that
24 -- that complex question.

25 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: That's

1 Undertaking 13. Mark Cliffe-Phillips.

2

3 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 13: Dominion Diamond to
4 explain how additive
5 synergistic or
6 antagonistic effects of
7 multiple contaminants were
8 addressed with respect to
9 similar and different
10 modes of toxic action,
11 including modifying
12 factors

13

14 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
15 with the Board. Can we please get that wording from
16 GNWT again?

17 MR. BARRY ZAJDLIK: Barry Zajdlik, on
18 behalf of GNWT. How were the additive synergistic or
19 antagonistic effects of multiple contaminants
20 addressed with respect to similar and different modes
21 of toxic action?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is that clear on the

1 undertaking?

2 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
3 Dominion Diamond. I think from talking to our team
4 that -- that we understand the question that -- that
5 Barry is -- or the -- the information that Barry is
6 seeking. So we -- we can -- we can respond to that --
7 to that undertaking.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you.
9 GNWT?

10 MR. BARRY ZAJDLIK: Barry Zajdlik. So
11 that would include an addition -- or the discussion of
12 toxicity modifying factors?

13 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful for
14 Golder Associates. Yeah, that undertaking will
15 include modifying factors in the response.

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
20 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with EN -- ENR. We have no
21 further questions.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
23 Questions, Yellowknives Dene First Nation?

24 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Thank you. I'm
25 Randy Freeman, with the Yellowknives Dene. I have a

1 couple of questions. During traditional knowledge
2 work done in the mid-1990s, Yellowknives Dene Elders
3 identified a number of areas in Lac de Gras, and Lac -
4 - Lac du Sauvage as places where in the spring the ice
5 would melt early. And these are shallows that they
6 would then -- the Yellowknives Dene would then go and
7 fish in those areas. And they -- they talked about
8 the fishing, and they talked about the spawning of
9 fish in these areas.

10 The areas they identified in Lac du
11 Sauvage were fairly small. There are two (2) areas in
12 the northeast, one (1) area around the eastern end of
13 the narrows, and one (1) apparently under -- or -- or
14 sorry, above Jay pipe. The -- the fact that they
15 talked about this -- these particular areas as fishing
16 and spawning areas, they didn't seem to make the
17 distinction back then that -- that there may be areas
18 that they fished in where they didn't see fish
19 spawning or vice versa.

20 I would like to know whether any of the
21 studies done by Golder identified Jay pipe bay, the
22 shallow bay, as a fish spawning area?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
2 Associates. There were a number of baseline data sets
3 considered and described in the baseline report
4 including the -- the traditional knowledge information
5 provided by the Yellowknives Dene in the -- in the
6 report completed in the '90s.

7 The information is consistent across
8 data sets including -- including the information the
9 Golder collected in 2013, ResCan in 2006, and -- and
10 other -- and other spawning shoal surveys that were
11 performed in -- in the 1990s. To follow up on -- on
12 the -- the information provided in -- in the
13 traditional knowledge report by the Yellowknives Dene
14 and to follow up on -- on some of our findings and
15 results in the assessment, Dominion recently performed
16 a -- a spawning shoal survey last week and -- to -- to
17 follow up on the baseline report and the assessment.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. CAM STEVENS: We -- we all -- this
22 is Cam Stevens, Golder Associates. And we -- we also
23 had somebody from the Yellowknives Dene with us during
24 those surveys.

25 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Randy Freeman,

1 Yellowknives Dene. You seemed to stop short of saying
2 yes or no to -- to the question. Is the shallow area
3 where Jay pipe is a -- a spawning area?

4 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
5 Associates. There are some spawning areas. There's
6 spawning -- small spawning shoals throughout Lac du
7 Sauvage and Lac de Gras. There's larger shoals in --
8 in other locations of the lake and in -- and
9 especially in Lac de Gras.

10 So the answer to the question is yes
11 there are some spawning shoals there and we have
12 recorded some spawning fish as we -- as we have -- as
13 others have reported in other parts of the -- of Lac
14 de Gras and Lac du Sauvage.

15 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Well, it's good to
16 hear that -- that -- sorry, Randy Freeman,
17 Yellowknives Dene. It's good to hear that science at
18 least backs up what -- what traditional knowledge
19 says.

20 You also -- this is a supplemental
21 question. You also talked about the connection
22 between Lac du Sauvage and -- and Lac de Gras. And I
23 think you used the word 'likely' which doesn't bring
24 any confidence to me. Likely fish move between the
25 two (2) lakes and I agree. They likely do, but -- but

1 do you have any evidence that they actually do.

2 And -- and I guess this is -- looking
3 at the -- the fact that there are a few spawning areas
4 within Lac du Sauvage while there appear to be many
5 within Lac -- or -- yeah, Lac du -- Lac de Gras.

6 So have there -- has there been any
7 work towards, I guess, bringing the -- that you could
8 -- you could bring some -- some more confidence to --
9 to the movement of fish between the two (2) lakes?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
14 Associates. So just to clarify there's -- there's lot
15 -- there is lots of spawning habitat in Lac du
16 Sauvage, but we -- the key point is that there's --
17 there -- there's certainly more of it and larger
18 shoals in -- in Lac de Gras. Fish move. Large fish
19 move even further than smaller fish. And some of
20 these species can move hundreds of kilometres between
21 a spawning habitat and over wintering habitat or a
22 foraging habitat and a spawning habitat. This is well
23 documented in the literature.

24 Our fuel crews have done -- have
25 performed snorkel surveys of the narrows. There's a

1 lot of traditional reports of fish in the narrows
2 moving through the nar -- narrows. There was other
3 research performed in the narrows suggesting that fish
4 likely do move between the two (2) lakes.

5 There's just no reason to believe that
6 fish aren't moving through the narrows, to be quite
7 honest. It's an open connection. It's a deep -- it's
8 a relatively deep connection. It's a short
9 connection. And -- and because of the life hi --
10 history characteristics of the -- the large body
11 species in the lake, there's -- it is very -- it's
12 highly likely that -- I'm almost certain that fish, 98
13 percent certain, if that's better, that it's one (1) -
14 - it's one (1) population unit.

15 And there's sufficient movement between
16 those two (2) lakes to warrant or to suggest that the
17 -- the population is operating at a much broader scale
18 than just one (1) lake.

19 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Randy Freeman,
20 Yellowknives Dene. I'm going to make a -- I mean,
21 IEMA had -- a question had revolved around, you know,
22 possible drop in level of water flow and the effects
23 that that may have on fish, and -- and I agree. I
24 mean, it's highly unlikely that fish don't migrate
25 between the two (2) lakes, but that brings it around

1 to, you know, possible water fluctuations in flow.

2 And you had mentioned that you were --
3 will be monitoring the flow of water during open water
4 season. I'm now going to make this -- make this
5 connection to caribou, which may not seem possible.
6 But I -- I have a question about the -- the nature of
7 the equipment to monitor that water level.

8 I'm not a -- I'm not a water person. I
9 -- I just was wondering if -- if this is something
10 that would be highly visible or invisible or highly
11 colourful or, you know, letting off rays that chase
12 caribou away. I don't know. I'm just wondering what
13 -- if you had thought of caribou in your plans to
14 monitor the water level as a -- as it being a very,
15 very, very important water crossing for caribou.

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
20 Dominion Diamond. So to measure water levels we would
21 install and have on our projects installed
22 transducers. They're just a small piece of equipment
23 installed in the water. They're very -- they're very
24 inconspicuous and -- and low profile and -- and don't
25 take up much space.

1 Yeah, non -- non-colourful and don't --
2 and don't... Yeah, and we don't -- sorry, they don't
3 emit any UV or -- or anything like that. We do have
4 some installed in the narrows right now. We are
5 collecting data there. For those of you that have
6 been there, I don't -- I don't know if you've -- you
7 even noticed them because they're -- they're...

8 Yeah, we -- we use them all the time or
9 -- or they're fairly standard to be used in -- in all
10 projects, both in the North and -- and across Canada,
11 so it's -- it's very well-known technology. It's very
12 low profile. It's -- it's not invasive fish and --
13 and obviously caribou, as well, which is the concern,
14 have not had an issue. We've never had any issue with
15 any -- any entanglement or anything like that in any
16 of the lakes or in the narrows that we have been
17 measuring with the transducers that are in place now.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: That was Claudine
22 Lee, with Dominion. I can't remember if I said my
23 name after that.

24 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power,
25 Yellowknives Dene. I guess I'd first like to thank

1 the Proponent for their presentation. I don't envy
2 the task of having to give a plain language discussion
3 on, you know, this computational model, and I just
4 want everyone to know that I'm really resisting making
5 jokes about gambling on Monte Carlo, and -- but it's
6 hard.

7 So -- so with the -- with the Jay Pit
8 and, you know, you're -- you're taking -- you're
9 making a fairly substantial hole in the ground, and
10 then of course following its closure it'll -- the
11 dikes will be breached and, you know, let water flow
12 back in.

13 In the model, was there an account made
14 for simultaneous very low water levels going into, you
15 know, day one (1) of breaching the dike say, you know,
16 if there were a drought in the Northwest Territories,
17 or something unforeseeable like that, coupled with,
18 you know, draining water back into this pit and what -
19 - how that would affect water levels particularly
20 connectivity between lakes?

21 For instance Paul Lake is a lake that
22 Elders are -- are -- and Yellowknife Dene Elders are
23 very concerned about being cut off, and how this might
24 affect spawning grounds.

25 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,

1 Dominion Diamond. So the concern would be the -- the
2 flow of water once we've breached the dike, and how
3 that may affect the narrows and -- and fishing? So
4 the -- the dike wouldn't be breached until it's --
5 it's partially full, so we're going to backfill before
6 we -- before we breach so it's going to be partially
7 filled.

8 And then as Elli -- Elliott said
9 earlier, we have control of the backfilling, and --
10 and we can -- we can modify that depending on water
11 levels, which we -- which we would monitor. So -- and
12 we could, yeah, monitor water levels and climate. So
13 we think that by do -- doing that -- we know by doing
14 that we can control water levels.

15 Like I said, there aren't very low
16 water levels at the narrows as a result of the
17 backfilling of -- of the Jay -- the Jay diked area.

18 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power,
19 Yellowknives Dene. Okay, thank you. Has Dominion
20 evaluated the possibility of -- of treating the saline
21 water?

22 Because of course all this is -- you
23 know, a lot of this is in response to the saline
24 groundwater fluxing into -- into these pits through a
25 method like reverse osmosis either directly of the

1 most saline water or -- or less saline water that will
2 then be pumped into, you know, the water shed. Or I
3 don't know, maybe even something more exotic, like
4 using reverse osmosis to maintain the salinity
5 gradient between the cap on meromictic lakes, you
6 know, keeping it -- keeping the water fresher, or
7 something. I don't know.

8 MR. RICHARD BARGER: Richard Barger,
9 Dominion Diamond. Well, I -- I -- well, first of all
10 I would say that we think we've -- we've developed a
11 very -- a very good mine water management plan to
12 manage -- manage the water.

13 The modelling indicates that that
14 treatment isn't needed, but it is sort of one of the
15 contingencies that are -- that's on our list at the
16 very -- but it would be one that would be, you know,
17 considered probably well down the list because it
18 brings its own issues and complexities.

19 So but I think the important point
20 here, Alex, is that we -- we think we have a very,
21 very solid mine water management plan that -- that
22 addresses all the issues with -- with the saline
23 water.

24 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power,
25 Yellowknives Dene. Thank you. So again, meromixis I

1 think, is -- is a really counterintuitive thing
2 initially. You know, you're -- you're relying on the
3 saline water not mixing with the -- with the
4 freshwater by virtue of it being saline and not fresh.
5 And of course the -- the stability of this system is -
6 - is largely dependent on maintaining that gradient.

7 So, you know, the more saline the one
8 side, and the -- the fresher the other side the
9 better. Part of this is dependent on, you know, water
10 not moving in and out say at -- at different levels of
11 -- of differential salinity. So, for instance, if --
12 you know, as has happened in -- in other meromictic
13 lakes, where you have water moving in at, you know,
14 upper levels of -- of the lake that have higher
15 salinity, like groundwater, for instance,
16 destabilizing the gradient and resulting in increased
17 mixing.

18 So with, you know, the planet getting
19 warmer and destabilization of permafrost seeming
20 imminent, is that a concern that -- that's been
21 addressed, i.e., you know, the ground melts, water
22 rushes in -- or, not rushes, but you know, water moves
23 in, destabilizing the gradient?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: Elliot
2 Holland, for Dominion Diamond. First I'd -- I'd like
3 to just spend a few seconds talking about meromixis.
4 It's a -- it's not a familiar word to -- to many lay
5 people. But I -- I don't want the -- the Board to
6 come away with the impression that -- that it's exotic
7 any way.

8 Differentiating liquids based on
9 density is, you know, what separates oil and water.
10 It -- it's present in a cappuccino. This is a -- this
11 is a fairly standard physical law. So with that as
12 context, I'll hand it over to our -- our consultants
13 to start confusing us again.

14 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
15 Herrell, from Golder Associates. Just to provide some
16 additional context to the -- the water quality
17 modelling that was done. Hydrodynamic modelling was
18 completed for both the -- the Jay and the Misery pits.
19 The purpose of these models was to assess the
20 likelihood of meromixis developing within the pits for
21 the -- the designed Water Management Plan, and then
22 whether that meromixis would remain stable into the
23 future.

24 The latter part of that considered all
25 of the inflows to the pit at different depths. So you

1 mentioned the other -- other pit lakes, such as those
2 mentioned in Peters and Lawrence (phonetic) in 2014,
3 where there were other inflows that influenced the
4 chemistry of those pit lakes. Those -- those are
5 unique pit lakes that have different water management
6 strategies from the -- the Jay pit. So considering
7 all the inflows at the Jay pit and also the -- the
8 Misery pit, the pits were predicted to remain
9 stratified throughout the two hundred (200) year
10 modelling time period.

11 In a -- in addition -- in addition to
12 the -- the modelling that was done as part of the DAR
13 we've, through a engagement with MVEIRB and the GNWT,
14 we have done several other modelling scenarios to see
15 if there are conditions that would turn over the --
16 the pits for these -- the Water Management Plan for
17 the -- the Jay Project.

18 And all scenarios modelled the pits
19 were actually predicted to remain stratified, even at
20 lower TDS concentrations. So I agree it -- it's not
21 always immediately intuitive what meromixis is, but
22 the -- the science behind it supports that the -- that
23 meromixis will form in these pits and remain stable in
24 the future.

25 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power, YKDFN.

1 Not to quibble, but oil and water aren't separate by
2 meromixis. They -- they stay separate because of, I
3 guess, differential ionicity, but -- and -- and, you
4 know, I -- I understand that the model shows them --
5 shows them staying separate. But, you know, it's a
6 probabilistic model, and it's saying that, you know,
7 given the, you know, parameters that have been
8 selected based on what we know, this is the -- the
9 expected outcome within some range of error.

10 So, like I said last night, model --
11 models aren't prescriptive. It doesn't predict the
12 future. I recognize their -- their value and I -- I
13 think this is -- this is -- is a thoughtful model and
14 I'm not -- I'm not disparaging it in any way. So
15 again -- so going back to things that can go -- go
16 wrong.

17 And now in the event that -- did the
18 model account for things like wall collapse within the
19 pit? Because that, of course, is something that's
20 happened in other meromictic lakes where, you know,
21 it's -- you know, you think of -- you -- you said a
22 cappuccino. And, of course, if -- a good example is
23 when you -- you pour sugar into your cappuccino and
24 you don't stir it, the sugar is nicely at the bottom
25 and gives you a -- a disgusting mouthful of sugar at

1 the end. And -- and so we -- we stir it up.

2 Now in the case of, you know, one (1)
3 of these pits, let's look at Bear Claw, because part
4 of the wall has degraded from -- it's -- it's trivial
5 degradation, granted, but a little bit of it's
6 collapsed because of where the processed kimberlite
7 has been pumped in as a slurry right at that point.

8 Let's say there's a catastrophic
9 collapse in the wall. That's -- you know, that's your
10 stir stick going in there. Has -- has that been
11 evaluated as a possibility?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
16 Dominion Diamond. We have -- we have actually
17 responded to this. So we're just going to -- it's a
18 similar kind of question so we'll -- we'll dig that
19 out.

20 I would note that for Alex is that we
21 did run a case where we essentially put a -- a full
22 case of sugar in to create some energy and it didn't
23 overturn, so.

24 MR. ALEX. POWER: Alex -- oh, sorry.

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Madam Chair,
4 Richard Bargery, Dominion Diamond.

5 We -- we have discussed that in
6 previous IRs. We can't -- we can't locate it right
7 now, so I -- I can't -- I can't give that answer, but
8 I'll -- I will dig out the -- the number of the IR
9 response and -- and provide that here later today.

10 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power,
11 Yellowknives Dene. Thank you for that. And if I
12 missed that response I credit it to the not over
13 abundance of capacity. And I appreciate you're
14 carrying the analogy of sugar forward.

15 So in the event of, you know,
16 catastrophic failure of the meromictic state either by
17 virtue of -- well, just by virtue of just some
18 unanticipated event, I don't know what, what's the
19 response -- what -- like, you know, to -- to borrow
20 from physics, because that seems to be what this is
21 about today, how do we uncrack that egg?

22 If the -- if the water all gets mixed
23 up and now we've got this, you know, little inland
24 sea, or, you know, whatever, this -- this highly
25 saline area whether it's at Misery or, you know, at

1 Bear Clar, or in the Jay pit where it's just through
2 no foreseeable scenario it -- it all just starts
3 mixing.

4 What -- what -- yes. What's -- what's
5 the response to that? How do we uncrack that egg?
6 How do we -- how do we fix that?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
11 Dominion Diamond. Sorry. Just in response to the --
12 to the earlier question, Alex, about -- about a
13 collapse of pit walls and -- and there is a -- a full
14 answer in IEMA IR-17 which is the First Round of IRs
15 and I can provide a copy of that to you.

16 In the case of -- of what -- what do
17 you do, I -- we have answered that as well in -- in
18 the IR rounds, but in the -- you know, in a low
19 likelihood event, a very low likelihood event, I mean,
20 really there's nothing you can do. But what our
21 models show is that the -- the pit would restratify
22 over time.

23 Thank you, Madam Chair.

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power,
2 Yellowknives Dene. I have no more questions -- or
3 Yellowknives Dene have no more questions. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you.
5 Just a comment in regards to the presentations. If
6 you could please keep on track with your questions and
7 have them limited to the project. And at this time,
8 we'd like to call a ten (10) minute break. Thank you.

9
10 --- Upon recessing at 10:39 a.m.

11 --- Upon resuming at 10:57 a.m.

12

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from
14 Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation?

15 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
16 K'e Dene First Nation. Just before I start my
17 questions I really wanted to thank the Board, but most
18 especially the Board staff. I'm pretty tired from
19 yesterday, and I didn't have to set any of this stuff
20 up, so thank you very much.

21 So my first question is: When talking
22 about meromixis Dominion cited several analogous lakes
23 as examples of meromixis at mine sites. These include
24 Gunnar Pit, Faro Pit, Grum Pit, and Vangorda Pit.

25 Does Dominion have any information

1 about how fish populations have changes in these lakes
2 before and after? Thank you.

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
7 Dominion Diamond. We haven't looked at that, to be --
8 to be frank, Peter. But we -- we are prepared to take
9 that away and -- and find out the information and come
10 -- and come back as an undertaking, but we -- we
11 haven't -- we haven't looked at it.

12 Richard Bargery, Dominion Diamond. I -
13 - I should note that we're not sure what information
14 is available, so we -- we'd -- I had to put that
15 caveat on it.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Legal counsel...?

17 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Thank you, Madam
18 Chair. It's John Donihee.

19 I understand then that Dominion will
20 look at what's happened with reference to fish
21 populations before and after the creation of these
22 meromictic lakes and the pits that Mr. Unger
23 mentioned. And that would be Undertaking number 14.

24

25 --- Undertaking No. 14: Dominion Diamond will look

1 at what's happened with
2 reference to fish
3 populations before and
4 after the creation of
5 these meromictic lakes and
6 the pits that Mr. Unger
7 mentioned

8
9 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery.
10 Yes, we have a list of those -- of those pits from --
11 I think that's from a response to one (1) of the IRs,
12 so, yes, we would do that. We would provide that if
13 the information is available.

14 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
15 K'e Dene First Nations. Thank you for that. So these
16 analogous lakes that I just listed off there, they're
17 all relatively closed. They're closed off pits.

18 Does Dominion have any examples of
19 analogous situations where a pit is connected to an
20 extensive network of water bodies, as the Jay Pit
21 would be?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike

1 Herrell, from Golder Associates.

2 So, no, we don't have an example where
3 there aren't any pits on land. But I do want to
4 clarify that -- that as we mentioned this morning,
5 there will be a dike that'll be built around the --
6 the Jay Pit area that will remain at 2 metres above
7 the -- the lake water surface, which will somewhat
8 connect that to the -- the land mass itself, and that
9 the -- the dike its -- will behave as a -- as a wind
10 barrier to the pit lake.

11 So it will behave in a similar fashion
12 to some of those lakes that are isolated more from
13 direct water bodies.

14 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
15 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation.

16 But it will be connected to the water
17 body. So is it fair to say that there are no previous
18 examples of what Dominion is proposing to attempt in
19 the Jay Pit? Thank you.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
24 Herrell, from Golder Associates.

25 Personally, I'm not aware of any pits

1 that are analogous to -- to this site in the North.
2 However, I -- I do want to be clear that we -- we have
3 modelled the processes of this pit, and the -- the
4 process of -- of development of meromixis in this pit
5 will be similar to all the other pits that we've sited
6 as analogous pit lakes to this -- this particular
7 project.

8 One (1) of the benefits of it actually
9 being exposed to an open-pit lake is that, in the
10 mixolimnion, the water that will -- that will flow
11 through the -- the upper layer of the pit will be --
12 will provide a constant flow of freshwater into the --
13 into the upper layer of the pit lake, creating a -- a
14 lower density mixolimnion, which will increase
15 stability in time.

16 And these processes are accounted for
17 in the -- in the water quality model. And for all the
18 scenarios we've modelled, there's no reason to believe
19 that meromixis won't form in these pits. And there's
20 confidence around the -- the predictions that
21 meromixis will remain stable in -- in the pits in the
22 long term.

23 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
24 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. I -- I just want
25 to be clear, though. So, I mean, we're basically

1 relying on the model, then. This kind of situation or
2 something very, very similar has really never been
3 attempted before.

4 Is that true? Thank you.

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
9 Herrell, from Golder Associates. Just to clarify, no.
10 Meromixis has been used at other projects, and it is -
11 - it is a phenomenon that it -- has occurred at other
12 projects. So it's not unique to the Jay -- Jay
13 Project itself.

14 Meromixis is a -- is a -- a mine water
15 management strategy that has been used at other mines,
16 so it's not just unique to this particular project.

17 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
18 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. I'm not talking
19 about the concept of meromixis being used at -- at a
20 mine site. My point is is that if you have a closed-
21 off lake or a pit lake, you know, however low the risk
22 of turnover is, the impacts of turnover seem much like
23 sig -- less significant.

24 My question is is: Has it ever been
25 tried before where a pit is part of a much larger

1 lake, and -- and that's where the meromixis is
2 occurring?

3 I'm going to get into whether the
4 meromixis will stay -- stay stable and all that stuff
5 in a moment. Right now, I'm just wanting to make it
6 clear that this is a relatively unique situation in
7 that it's connected to a much larger lake.

8 I -- I understand that the model, you
9 know, favours that meromixis will stay stable. I just
10 want to know that we don't really have any previous
11 examples of this specific situation.

12 Is that true? Thank you.

13 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: Elliot Holland,
14 for Dominion. Peter, I -- what I would say is there's
15 no perfect analogies. I mean, we -- we can't find a -
16 - a pit which is exactly the same in every way.

17 But meromixis in general is a -- is a
18 principle that -- that's -- that's quite common. And
19 because that this project does have certain elements
20 which are -- which are unique, we haven't just done a
21 model. I

22 n fact, we've done a -- a raft of
23 models ranging from, you know, conservative to very
24 conservative to -- to what Rick described as Biblical,
25 where we have winds that -- that typically only occur

1 at the ten thousandth (10,000th) of a time -- of the
2 time blowing across the surface of the lake for a
3 year.

4 So -- so we think that our -- our
5 modelling -- our -- our models, you know, multiple,
6 taken as a whole, appropriately address the -- the
7 circumstances which -- which are unique, and -- and
8 give good confidence to -- to the Board that we've --
9 we've appropriately assessed the -- the situation.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
12 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. So again, I'm
13 not disputing the model. I just -- I just want to
14 make it clear that this specific situation hasn't been
15 tried before.

16 Moving on, I understand it's a one (1)
17 in ten thousand (10,000) chance, but let's say the one
18 (1) in ten thousand (10,000) chance happens through --
19 however improbable it may be. Has Dominion done any
20 analysis of what the impacts would be if there was to
21 be a turnover in the Jay Pit? Thank you.

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike

1 Herrell, from Golder Associates.

2 Just to be clear, the -- the wind speed
3 that occurs at one tho -- one thousandth (1,000th) of
4 the time, that -- that's the wind speed occurring. We
5 sustained that wind speed for a period of a year, just
6 to give an example of how extreme that -- that
7 situation is. It's not likely to occur.

8 And in that scenario, for the upper --
9 we ran that scenario for both our -- the EA
10 conservative case, the reasonable estimate case, and
11 the lower bound scenario. And under all of those
12 scenarios, the pits were not predicted to overturn.
13 The meromixis formed in that.

14 The second part of your question, you
15 asked if we have evaluated what is -- what is the
16 water quality if the pit does overturn? We did do
17 that in -- I believe it was IR Round I, and we'll dig
18 that out and we can provide you with a reference to
19 that. Thanks.

20 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
21 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation.

22 In IR-I, I know we're going to get to
23 that, did you also evaluate, you know, potential
24 residual impacts? So how this water quality would
25 effect aquatic life, and even terrestrial life that

1 depends on this water? Thank you.

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
6 Dominion Diamond. So we did compare it to -- to
7 current guidelines, but we don't -- we don't have what
8 parameters we -- we compared. So we're going to have
9 to dig out the -- the full IR ref -- reference, and --
10 and provide that, Peter, because it is fairly -- I
11 think fairly lengthy.

12

MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
13 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation.

14

So you mentioned that, you know, I've
15 heard in terms of time, two hundred (200) years
16 mentioned, and -- and things like that. So Lutsel K'e
17 Dene First Nation intends to use this land in
18 perpetuity forever.

19

So, you know, again, I don't -- I don't
20 have the technical expertise to -- to follow a lot of
21 what's going on, but basically can you guarantee the
22 Jay Pit will never mix, not just in fifty (50) years,
23 not centuries from now, and not millennia from now?
24 Thank you.

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
4 Herrell, for -- from Golder Associates.

5 So as part of the DAR, there was
6 actually two (2) models that were done on -- on the
7 pit lake to evaluate water quality in -- in the long-
8 term. So there was the -- the CE-QUAL model, which
9 was a ran for a period of two hundred (200) years.
10 That's the hydrodynamic model. The purpose of that
11 model is to look at the hydrodynamics in the pit and
12 see if meromixis will -- will form and -- and remain
13 stable.

14 We also -- the reason that it's run for
15 a period of two hundred (200) years is it's
16 computationally intensive, and to run it for a much
17 longer period of time, it -- it's not always amenable
18 to the permitting process. However, to look at long-
19 term stability within the pit lake and the long-term
20 concentrations, we also did a vertical slice
21 spreadsheet model. And that's -- that's provided in
22 Appendix 8G of the -- of the DAR. And that was also
23 updated as part of the compendium for the -- the
24 reasonable estimate case.

25 The -- the outcome of that model

1 indicates that the -- in the Misery Pit, since there
2 isn't a groundwater inflow into the pit, the -- the
3 lower levels of the pit will actually -- there's --
4 there's a conduit that will drain out into Lac de
5 Gras. It's about 42 metres cubed per day. So it's a
6 very small rate that the -- the lower part of the pit
7 will drain or seep out of the -- out of the bottom of
8 the pit.

9 And as that happens, the model
10 indicates that the lower part of the pit will be
11 fleshed out with -- with freshwater from the -- the
12 upper layer. And then that'll be recharged by surface
13 runoff. So what that modelling indicates, which was
14 run for a period of fifteen thousand (15,000) years,
15 is that it will become fresher in the long term, and
16 be a -- a freshwater body in -- in the long term, even
17 at depth.

18 And the -- the modelling for the -- the
19 Jay Pit also indicates that the -- the net groundwater
20 outflow from the pit is positive. So more groundwater
21 will leave at depth from inflow into the Jay pit. So
22 that will also become fresher in the long-term, too,
23 in -- in periods of -- of fifteen thousand (15,000)
24 years, so.

25 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter

1 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation.

2 I'm going to move on to the waste rock
3 storage area. So the waste rock storage area is very
4 close to several water bodies, which is a big concern
5 for the community of Lutsel K'e. And -- and again,
6 we've -- we've gone over this a few times before.
7 Basically, we're -- we're again looking at the very
8 long term, so not fifty (50) years, not a hundred
9 years, but you know, millennia from now.

10 Can you guarantee that there won't be
11 any seepage, you know, accounting for climate change?
12 Assuming it does get much warmer up here, can -- can
13 Dominion guarantee that there will be no seepage from
14 the waste rock storage area ever? Thank you.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
19 Golder Associates. Guarantees, Peter. Yeah -- yeah,
20 we -- we're always looking for guarantees.

21 But I've got to -- got to provide you
22 with the -- the confidence that the -- the waste rock
23 storage area has been designed to -- to promote
24 runoff. And -- and that -- that input has been
25 included in -- in the operational and -- and closure

1 modelling for -- for the -- for the project.

2 As part of the construction and the
3 operation, and in the closure periods, they'll be
4 monitoring, and to -- to determine the performance and
5 to make sure that it is meeting the expectations that
6 -- that the Company has put in terms of its
7 performance.

8 The -- certainly, the -- the seepage
9 chemistry that -- that has been included as part of
10 the -- as part of the -- the assessment has -- has
11 been accounted for in the site water quality model,
12 and has been included in the -- in the Lac de Gras,
13 and Lac -- and -- and Lac du Sauvage hydrodynamic
14 water quality models.

15 And so we're -- we're confident that --
16 that that input has been accounted for, and -- and
17 supports the conclusion that -- that no adverse
18 effects are -- are expected as a result of the runoff
19 or the seepage that will be generated from that
20 facility.

21 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
22 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation.

23 So I guess the concern is is that the
24 mine will eventually close, you know, in however many
25 years that may be. And then the mine staff will go

1 and, you know, Dominion may still exist, or it may
2 not. We're very confident that Lutsel K'e will still
3 exist. Our concern is is that either of these things,
4 the Jay Pit overturning or seepage from the waste rock
5 pile happens long after you're gone, and then what do
6 we do?

7 Is there anything Dominion can do? Are
8 there any assurances Dominion can offer? Are there
9 any measures that Dominion can think of, like, to
10 propose to -- to put our minds at ease? Thank you.

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
15 Dominion Diamond. We -- we have a -- an interim
16 closure and reclamation plan in place now for -- for
17 Ekati and the waste rock piles. It's regulated by the
18 Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board. The Jay waste rock
19 storage area would -- would similarly have a plan that
20 would be included in the closure plan. It would be
21 regulated by the Board and would go through the full -
22 - the full regulatory review.

23 So I'm not sure if that gives you the
24 comfort you're looking for, Peter, but that's --
25 that's the process.

1 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank --

2 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Sorry, just --

3 John just reminded me. It's -- I don't think we've
4 said it, but I mean, our -- our commitment is -- is to
5 meet all those closure objectives in that plan,
6 obviously, including those related to the waste rock
7 storage areas.

8 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
9 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation.

10 So, you know, we're confident that the
11 Company has the best intentions and we're confident
12 that all the companies around the Company is going to
13 do what it can to address any issues.

14 My question is: Do you have any
15 provisions at all for post-closure? And I'll be
16 frank, I don't really know what that would look like,
17 but I'm just asking you: Do you have any provisions
18 at all for post-closure? Thank you.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
23 Dominion Diamond. So the -- the post-closure period,
24 there's a monitoring period for all parts of Ekati
25 post-closure for a -- a period of -- of ten (10)

1 years, I believe. And there would be other mechanisms
2 in place. For example, our friends at IEMA will be in
3 place to ensure that we meet -- meet those
4 requirements, and IEMA's going to continue during that
5 period, so.

6 I -- I'm not 100 percent sure I've
7 answered your question exactly, Peter, but -- but
8 hopefully, I have.

9 MR. PETER UNGER: Yeah, you -- you
10 kind of have. Sorry, Peter Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene
11 First Nation.

12 I mean, again, we're thinking on
13 different time scales here. Lutsel K'e wants to
14 ensure that the land is -- is clean and healthy and
15 that the water is also clean and healthy forever.

16 So, you know, ten (10) years seems very
17 small on that scale. And I'd -- I'd love to see if
18 there's something we could think of for longer term,
19 if there's anything we can think of to -- to address
20 that. Thank you. I have no further questions.
21 Thanks.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
23 Questions, Tlicho Government?

24 MS. GRACE MACKENZIE: Grace Mackenzie,
25 Tlicho Government. No questions.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
2 Environment Canada?

3 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
4 Environment Canada. We have a few questions. So the
5 first of our questions is related to slide 14 on the
6 post-closure equality of Misery Pit.

7 So given that the adjustment of the
8 depth of the freshwater cap is the contingency options
9 provided by Dominion, and -- and this would involve
10 additional transfer of poor quality water from Misery
11 to Jay, how sensitive is the Jay Pit stability to
12 further inputs from Misery if this larger freshwater
13 cap is needed to maintain the water quality in the
14 Misery freshwater cap below guidelines?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
19 Herrell, for -- for Golder Associates.

20 So we have done the modelling of
21 various fresh-water caps and evaluated what the
22 influence of pumping additional water in the vent that
23 a -- a deeper fresh-water cap would be used in -- in
24 the -- the Jay Pit, and looked at the TDS
25 concentrations and the mixolimnion of the Jay Pit

1 following back-flooding of that pit.

2 And the outcome of that modelling is
3 that the -- the TDS concentrations in the mixolimnion
4 are not that sensitive to the increased volume for the
5 scenarios that we've modelled.

6 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Thank you. Meagan
7 Tobin, with Environment Canada.

8 My next few questions relate to slide
9 32. So Dominion had stated that they disagree with
10 the idea that the study area boundaries needs to be
11 aligned between the AEMP and the effects study area,
12 because the AEMP has different specific objectives
13 than the effects study area.

14 Does Dominion acknowledge that one (1)
15 purpose of the AEMP is to also verify the EA
16 predictions?

17 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
18 Associate. Yes.

19 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
20 Environment Canada. So with that, how will the larger
21 assessment area allow for validation of the statement
22 that mining of the Jay Project will not result in
23 significant adverse impacts to the surface water
24 quality and aquatic life in Lac du Sauvage
25 specifically?

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. CAM STEVENS: So it -- this is a -
4 - Cam Stevens, Golder Associates.

5 This is accomplished by essentially
6 designing a monitoring program to detect early warning
7 changes in the measurement indicators. These are the
8 quantifiable expressions of the aquatic environment
9 that influ -- influence the assessment end points,
10 which for fish was ongoing fisheries productivity.

11 As such, the monitoring of the health
12 of small-bodied fish is -- is proposed as a
13 measurement indicator, and providing a surrogate to
14 conduct -- to -- to conducting a -- a large-bodied
15 fish program which -- and for, as -- as mentioned
16 earlier, the -- the larger -- larger-bodied species
17 occupy a -- a larger area than -- than some of the
18 smaller species that occur in the lake.

19 And this approach is well-established
20 in the literature because environmental impacts should
21 be identified in small-bodied fish before they're
22 detected in top predators such as lake trout and lake
23 whitefish. And this approach is consistent with other
24 monitoring programs in the North.

25 Furthermore, monitoring will initially

1 be focussed in Lac du Sauvage where local-scale
2 effects, if any, are likely to occur, with additional
3 monitoring areas potentially added to the AEMP study
4 design to address late operations during future
5 iterations of the AEMP design plan.

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. CAM STEVENS: So if -- if small-
10 scale effects are -- are reported, a -- a response
11 action would be -- would be developed. And -- and
12 this may include, for example, non-lethal testing of -
13 - of large-bodied fish, the collection of tissue
14 plugs, for example. This would be considered as a
15 response if a low action is triggered for the health
16 of small-bodied fish.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dominion, is that
21 your final answer?

22 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Yes. Richard
23 Bargery, Dominion Diamond. Yes.

24 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
25 Environment Canada. So you'd mentioned that the

1 current study design for the AEMP is small-bodied fish
2 as a surrogate for large-bodied fish. We had noted
3 previously that the numbers of small-bodied fish in
4 Lac du Sauvage may not be sufficient to be able to
5 complete such a study.

6 Has further information on the fish
7 populations been collected, and if there aren't enough
8 small-bodied fish, how will the EA predictions be
9 verified?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
14 Dominion Diamond. So we don't think that that's
15 accurate, that there would not be enough of a
16 population of small-bodied fish. In the Developer's
17 Assessment Report, we did outline the fish that we
18 have found and expect to occur from the baseline
19 study.

20 Again, the development of the Aquatic
21 Effects Monitoring Program, we have submitted a
22 conceptual plan on that and do intend to complete
23 further engagement on what -- what would be
24 appropriate. We have in the conceptual plan, for
25 various reasons, identified that small-bodied fish is

1 -- is what we -- what we're proposing.

2 Again, as -- as Cam Stevens, from
3 Golder, mentioned, that response framework would be
4 developed, and triggers around that would also be
5 developed. And if we were to see something along
6 those lines, a response plan would be put in place.
7 And that response plan would potentially consider
8 other ways of collecting that information to determine
9 the -- the assessment -- to compare against the
10 assessment that's been completed.

11 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Thanks for that.
12 Meagan Tobin, with Environment Canada.

13 Just one (1) last question again with
14 regards to the AEMP and the potential for baseline
15 monitoring.

16 So what progress has been made on the
17 selection of a suitable reference lake for Lac du
18 Sauvage specifically, and will there be a collection
19 of sufficient baseline data prior to construction?

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee, from
24 Dominion Diamond. So on the conceptual Aquatic
25 Effects Monitoring Plan that we've put in place, we

1 have done some engagement. And during that
2 engagement, we -- I think the last workshop was in --
3 in July, we did talk about a study to determine an
4 appropriate reference lake. We're not sure that there
5 is one, which is why we have committed to going ahead
6 with the study which is currently underway.

7 As well, during that engagement
8 session, we did talk about having another engagement
9 meeting in December. And we would be pulling together
10 the information that we had already collected on that
11 commitment to determine whether or not there's an
12 appropriate reference lake, and that would be -- that
13 would be a part of that, as well, part of that
14 discussion with the ongoing engagement with the
15 Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program design plan.

16 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Thank you. Meagan
17 Tobin, with Environment Canada.

18 So if a suitable reference lake cannot
19 be found, would an in-lake reference area be used
20 instead?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
25 Dominion Diamond. We -- you know, part of -- part of

1 this work to determine whether or not there is an
2 appropriate reference lake, that -- that would be part
3 of it. And we -- our plan, and what we've put forward
4 in our -- our engagement plan for -- for the Aquatic
5 Effects Monitoring Program design plan going forward,
6 includes the engagement with communities and
7 regulators on this. So again -- again, it's a -- a
8 work in progress. We're -- we're starting on that
9 early. We're -- we're putting some of this
10 information together.

11 And -- and in consideration as well,
12 not just looking at what may be appropriate, if there
13 is something appropriate, but also taking into
14 consideration all reference lake information, you
15 know, for Ekati and Diavik that we do have for the
16 last sixteen (16) or -- or however many -- many years
17 that the -- those two (2) locations have been in
18 operation.

19 So we -- we would include all of that
20 information in our -- in our study of determining
21 whether or not there is an appropriate reference lake.
22 And we'll continue to engage on that through both the
23 permitting process, and through the engagement that we
24 have already committed to as part of some of the
25 workshops and engagement that's been completed to

1 date.

2 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
3 Environment Canada. I guess, do you guy -- do you
4 commit to collecting sufficient baseline data prior to
5 construction, giving that the timeline for collection
6 of this data is starting -- is shrinking?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
11 Dominion Diamond. So, you know, we -- we commit to --
12 to this reference lake study to -- to determine
13 whether or not there is an appropriate reference lake.

14 Just a note of clarification that there
15 isn't effluent discharge until year 5, so the timeline
16 is -- is not short. And, you know, as mentioned quite
17 a bit this morning, we -- we do have time for some
18 operational monitoring as well that will -- will go
19 into that. And we are currently working on the
20 Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program design plan some of
21 these components would fall into.

22 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
23 Environment Canada. Thank you. We have no more
24 questions.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

1 Questions from Fisheries and Oceans Canada?

2 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
3 and Oceans Canada. I just have one (1) question and
4 one (1) point of clarification.

5 I would like Dominion Diamond to
6 confirm that their assessment of impacts to fish and
7 fish habitat in Lac du Sauvage considered the lake as
8 -- as a separate entity, in addition to considering it
9 with respect to Lac de Gras as well.

10 There's been a lot of talk about
11 whether or not fish do or do not move through the
12 narrows, and I just want to confirm that they have
13 considered the impacts to Lac du Sauvage as an entity
14 of -- in and of itself.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
19 Associates. The answer is yes, through -- within the
20 DAR itself, and -- and through a -- a number of the
21 responses to the Information Requests during Round I
22 and Round II.

23 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
24 and Oceans Canada. Thank you. No more questions.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North

1 Slave Metis Alliance?

2 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Thank you, Madam
3 Chair. Shin Shiga, North Slave Metis Alliance. I
4 have a couple questions.

5 After the closure of the Jay pipe, how
6 is the fish habitat in the area above the Jay -- Jay
7 pipe going to be compared to the baseline?

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
12 Associates. The -- so the diked area will be
13 reconnected when water quality meets standards. And
14 when it meets those standards, the -- the notches in
15 the dike will be opened, allowing some movement --
16 some cur -- natural currents and flows to -- to
17 reestablish in that area of the lake.

18 The pit will remain. The -- the Jay
19 Pit will remain within the dewatered area. That's
20 approximately 65 hectares. There'll be -- the remnant
21 portions of the dike along the dike area, that will
22 remain at closure. And -- but everything else will be
23 relatively intact, and we're expecting the -- the area
24 to recover quickly.

25 Species occurring in -- in the area

1 will reestablish in that area, and we expect the
2 functions to be similar to other functions provided in
3 other areas of the lake following closure.

4 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
5 Slave Metis Alliance. I just wanted to -- to get a
6 clarification.

7 So comparing the baseline to post-
8 closure, are you saying, then, that the habitat
9 quality does not change?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
14 -- Golder Associate. I -- I guess the point I want to
15 make is that the habitat will be different, and for
16 any permanent losses incurred by -- by the project,
17 those losses will be addressed in the Final Offsetting
18 Plan, and -- and finalized during the -- the review
19 process -- or the permitting process with DFO.

20 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Thank you. Shin
21 Shiga, North Slave Metis Alliance.

22 Just a -- a quick preamble. The area
23 under the consideration is a very, very culturally
24 important area. That's where people camped, fished
25 while they waited for caribou. That's where they

1 gathered.

2 The -- the permanent loss of fish
3 habitat is going to be significant, not -- not just
4 because of the -- it's not something that can be
5 easily replaced by restoring fish habitat elsewhere,
6 because of that cultural importance. I just wanted to
7 make that statement, and one (1) more question.

8 Is -- in the offset plan that Dominion
9 Diamond is required to do, is Dominion Diamond going
10 to be responsible for the restored habitats remaining
11 functional in the future?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
16 Dominion Diamonds. Shin, just to be clear, which --
17 the habitat under the offsetting plan, is that the
18 habitat that you're -- you're asking about, or the
19 habitat in the -- in the Jay Pit area?

20 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
21 Slave Metis Alliance. The offset plan.

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: So -- Richard

1 Bargery, Dominion Diamond. So it's -- it's the --
2 it's the habitat under the offsetting plan, yes, we
3 are responsible for that habitat.

4 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
5 Slave Metis Alliance. Is there a duration of time
6 you're going to be responsible for that habitat?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
11 Dominion Diamond. So that would be determined in --
12 in our offsetting discussions with -- with DFO, I
13 believe, and would be a subject of -- of discussion
14 during our engagement with -- with communities on that
15 offsetting plan as well, I would -- I would note.

16 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
17 Slave Metis Alliance. Thank you. That's all my
18 questions.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Deninu
20 Kue First Nations?

21 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Thank you,
22 Madam Chair. It's Marc d'Entremont, for the DKFN.

23 First, I'd just like to acknowledge
24 that we have Dr. Elmar Plate on the line, who is our
25 fish and aquatic specialist. He's provided me with a

1 few questions. I'll -- I'll proceed with those. And
2 afterwards, if there's any clarifications, I'll get
3 Elmar to ask those.

4 So first of all, with regards to your
5 modelling for the meromictic conditions, we just want
6 to confirm in the consideration of these models, that
7 you scouted the literature and particularly looked at
8 those existing conditions, so those exam -- other
9 examples that you had -- had mentioned in terms of
10 other pits that have done these mero -- meromictic
11 processes.

12 So in your model, did you -- did you
13 consider any situations where the case may have been
14 that meromictic conditions did not form as predicted?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
19 Herrell, from Golder Associates. So the modelling as
20 part of the DAR indicated that based on the inputs to
21 the model, the Water Management Plan that was
22 considered in the modelling indicated that meromixis
23 would form.

24 As part of the -- the review process,
25 there's been a lot of questions about meromixis and

1 the stability of meromixis in -- in response to -- to
2 those -- those Information Requests. A lot of
3 additional modelling has been done, as everyone here
4 is familiar with, which includes the lower bound
5 scenario, the reasonable estimate case.

6 The meromixis is -- was predicted to
7 form and then in an attempt to try and turn over the
8 pits, we did the extreme case scenario and the pits
9 didn't -- didn't overturn. So there's confidence in
10 the modelling that has been completed to date that
11 meromixis will form and remain stable.

12 However, in IR Round II, and Peter, you
13 were asking about this earlier and we said we would
14 get that reference for you, and, Madame Chair, I'm
15 hoping it's okay that I provide this at this point in
16 time, because it'll address both parties.

17 In -- in the MVEIRB IR Round II-24,
18 they -- they asked us to model the -- the influence of
19 a fully mixed pit in Lac du Sauvage and Lac de Gras.

20 So modelling was done where the pits
21 were actually forced to be turned over, and the
22 effects of that turned-over chemistry was evaluated in
23 Lac du Sauvage and Lac de Gras at the assessment
24 locations that were included in the DAR.

25 So to answer your question, have we

1 considered a -- a scenario where the pits have
2 overturned, yes, we have.

3 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
4 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. Okay. Thanks for that
5 answer. So my next question -- so I think you've
6 mentioned this in your presentation, but I just want
7 to confirm.

8 So is Dominion committing to chronic
9 sub-lethal toxic -- toxicity testing in the Jay Pit
10 before the dikes are breached for post-closure, or for
11 closure?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
16 Golder Associates. Sorry, Marc. It was my
17 misinterpretation of your question. The answer to
18 that is -- is a -- is a yes to that as well. And that
19 would be done during the -- the back-flooding and --
20 and particularly well before any decision to -- to
21 reconnect the Jay Pit to the Lac du Sauvage.

22 I think the commitment that Dominion
23 have made there is that you -- that water quality
24 within the -- the back-flooded diked area has to meet
25 regulatory criteria.

1 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Thanks. Marc
2 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. So one (1) final question
3 then relating to fish. Will Dominion Diamond be using
4 -- for any water course crossings, will it be using
5 bottomless culverts?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
10 Dominion Diamond. In the case of culverts and the
11 design of culverts, we would be working with DFO to
12 determine what the best type of culvert would be for
13 that appropriate location. Yeah. Thank you.

14 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
15 d'Entremont, for DKFN. Okay. Thanks for that.
16 Unless Elmar has any points of clarification, I think
17 that's the end of our questions.

18 MR. ELMAR PLATE (BY PHONE): Can you
19 hear me? Elmar Plate, for the Dene Kue. Can you hear
20 me? Can you please confirm?

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, we can.

22 MR. ELMAR PLATE (BY PHONE): Okay.
23 Thank you. So this is Elmar Plate for Deni -- Deninu
24 Kue. I just wanted to add a little bit to Marc's
25 comments.

1 So in the meromictic -- the meromictic
2 condition is not quite as stable as you describe it to
3 be. In the example of the ground mine, the Vangorda
4 mine, the water line and the main zone and the Z2P
5 mines -- and I've -- I've provided all the information
6 before.

7 The meromictic condition under similar
8 conditions then here -- here was not permanent, though
9 there are quite a few examples where the meromictic
10 condition is not permanent. And so the one (1) in ten
11 thousand (10,000) chance, or a characterization of a
12 one (1) in ten thousand (10,000) chance I think is
13 only based on the model but not on the real world
14 where actually the meromictic condition all -- doesn't
15 always seem to persist.

16 That's my first comment. Probably --
17 I'll let you answer to that first.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
22 Herrell, from Golder Associates. I do want to
23 clarify a couple of things here.

24 First, the -- the one (1) in ten
25 thousand (10,000), that -- that doesn't relate to a

1 predication or a chance of these pits overturning. We
2 haven't actually done that analysis. That relates to
3 the wind speed that was selected as part of the
4 extreme case scenario.

5 So what we did in that scenario was we
6 picked a wind speed equal to the 99.99th percentile
7 observed wind speed on the MET4 data that was used for
8 the project, and sustained that wind speed for the
9 period of one (1) year. So related to the -- the pit
10 lakes that you referred to, Elmer, they're not 100
11 percent similar to the Jay Project, so they can't be
12 necessarily used to stated that the Jay Pit will not
13 be as stable as we think it is.

14 The Jay Pit is quite unique from these
15 particular sites. So in -- those sites that you're
16 referring to are well documented in Pieters and
17 Lawrence in 2014, and three (3) of them were -- were
18 reported to be meromictic, one (1) was uncertain, one
19 (1) was holomictic, and one (1) was intermittent.

20 The -- the reason for the -- the
21 overturns in those pits are -- were for several
22 different reasons, as documented in that paper. For
23 example, one of the pits overturned as a result of ARD
24 sludge being placed in the pit, which comes back to a
25 comment made earlier this morning regarding putting

1 sugar in the bottom of the pit. So that would be an
2 analog for that.

3 Another key difference of those pits is
4 the -- the TDS concentrations in the mixolimnion
5 compared to the -- the monimolimnion, or the -- the
6 density grading is not as great as we see at the --
7 the Jay -- in the Jay Pit. So there what we see is
8 the salt deficit ratio is much less in comparison to
9 the Jay Pit, and we've done that analysis as part of
10 IRs in Round 2 at the request of -- of GNWT.

11 A key difference for the -- the Jay
12 Project is that it's going to be an engineered pit
13 lake. None of the pit lakes in those papers were
14 engineered pit lakes where saline water was actually
15 placed in the bottom of a pit, and then capped with
16 freshwater. And that in -- is one of the -- the main
17 differences, and the key strengths of meromixis at the
18 Jay Project is that the saline water is going to be
19 deliberately moved to the bottom of the Jay Pit, and
20 then capped with freshwater in a way to preclude
21 mixing of the -- the two (2) water bodies.

22 And for that purpose, that's a reason
23 that we get much different salt deficit ratios, and
24 higher meromictic ratios in comparison to the pits
25 that are presented in those papers.

1 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: Elliot Holland,
2 for Dominion Diamond. Let me just add a little less
3 technical comment. Again, we -- we don't have -- have
4 perfect -- perfect analogs here. There -- there are
5 differences. We -- we discussed that during the --
6 the questions from -- from Lutsel K'e Dene First
7 Nation.

8 I mean, what we can -- we can certainly
9 say with -- with a lot of certainty from Dominion is
10 that we've run multiple, multiple models at the
11 request of -- of multiple parties, and -- and
12 consultants to -- to multiple parties, and the results
13 of -- of every one of those analyses from -- from a
14 range of -- of people once they've spent time with our
15 -- our experts who are -- are really worldwide leaders
16 in the field, has been ultimately the conclusion that
17 our -- our design is robust. And we feel comfortable
18 about the design.

19 You know, we can certainly continue to
20 have discussions about, you know, different --
21 different parameters and different modelling runs but,
22 you know, we would submit that the -- the modelling in
23 this area has gone, you know, above and beyond in
24 response to -- to a number of parties' requests.
25 Thank you.

1 MR. ELMER PLATT (BY PHONE): Okay.

2 And thank you for those answers. And I have one (1)
3 more. This is Elmer Platt calling -- talking again.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: If you could please
5 identify yourself again.

6 MR. ELMER PLATT (BY PHONE): Yeah,
7 it's Elmer Platt for Deninu K'ue. Just -- you always
8 say at the closure there will a dike will remain
9 around the Jay pit. It -- it's only interrupted
10 basically in a few areas.

11 Can you just for my memory tell again -
12 - tell us again how much of the dam will actually be
13 breached, and how much of the dike will be left?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: : It's Elliot
18 Holland, for Dominion Diamond. The -- the total dike
19 length is on the order of 5 kilometres. Our -- our
20 proposed design has four (4) narrow breaches. We
21 don't have a -- a very detailed design, but the
22 breaches are expected to be on the order of -- of 10
23 metres in length. So we're -- around 1 percent of the
24 -- the dike's total length. Thank you.

25 MR. ELMER PLATT (BY PHONE): Okay.

1 Thank you. That was the one (1) clarification I still
2 needed. Just -- this is Elmer Platt. The last
3 question or clarification is: You have said you're
4 committing to sub-lethal testing before you are going
5 to breach the dike.

6 And my question is whether you're
7 committing to the sixty (60) day midge and forty-eight
8 (48) day hyalella azteca tests, or whether you're
9 going for much shorter tests that are typically done.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
14 Dominion Diamond. That is still to be determined.
15 And the -- the plan for that is to be worked on
16 through the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program.

17 MR. ELMER PLATT (BY PHONE): Okay.
18 Thank you for that answer.

19 I highly encourage you to go by those
20 tests, and not any of the lower standard tests. We
21 have found, in many cases, differences between ten
22 (10), forty (40) days exposures and sixty (60), forty-
23 eight (48) day exposures. That's my last question.
24 Thank you.

25 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: It's Marc

1 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. That concludes all our
2 questions. Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
4 Questions, Diavik Diamond Mines?

5 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Hi, Gord
6 MacDonald, with Diavik. Slide 17, if you could.

7 On this slide you say that the -- that
8 DD -- DDEC has adequately addressed the potential
9 effects of the Jay Project on downstream users.

10 Appreciate the -- that DDEC is a predicted downstream
11 water quality and compared these to guidelines for
12 aquatic life and drinking water. And well, we're not
13 aquatic life, and Diavik is a drinking water user.

14 But -- but have the -- other than those
15 comparisons, have you evaluated the effects of Jay on
16 Diavik as a downstream user?

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
21 Dominion Diamond. I -- we did provide a response to a
22 question that came from the technical sessions, I
23 believe, on -- on Diavik's use. And we provided that
24 in -- I -- I don't remember the exact day, Gord, but -
25 - but if that -- is that your -- your point, sorry?

1 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Gord MacDonald,
2 with Diavik. In that assessment, you've basically
3 said that, if it's -- if the water around Diavik meets
4 aquatic standards or drinking water standards, that
5 there wouldn't be an impact on Diavik. That was as
6 far as the evaluation went.

7 Did -- my question is: Did it go any
8 further than that? We -- we think there are other
9 potential effects to Diavik. That's what's in our
10 technical submissions. We just wanted to confirm that
11 you haven't done any further evaluation on that.

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
16 Dominion Diamond. The -- the extent of our assessment
17 is -- is in MVEIRB IR232, and we have not gone further
18 than that.

19 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Gord MacDonald,
20 with Diavik. Thank you.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fort
25 Resolution Metis Council? Questions, Transport

1 Canada?

2 MR. CHRISTOPHER AGUIRE: Chris Aguire,
3 with Transport Canada. We have no questions.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
5 Board staff and counsel? Okay, we'll break for lunch
6 right now. And we'll come back to the staff.

7

8 --- Upon recessing at 12:02 p.m.

9 --- Upon resuming at 1:07 p.m.

10

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, we left off at
12 lunch with questions from Review Board staff and
13 counsel.

14 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: It's Sachi De
15 Souza, with the Review Board. There have been a fair
16 number of questions about the long-term stability of
17 meromixis, and this ties into the -- the closure for
18 Misery Pit Lake.

19 The question is: The current ICRP
20 states that -- or the current closure plan states that:

21 "The objectives for closure are to
22 facilitate the establishment of a
23 self-sustaining aquatic ecosystem in
24 the pit lakes and to ensure that the
25 fish -- pit lakes are safe for fish

1 pass -- passage."

2 The Jay Project will affect what
3 Dominion does at closure. For the Misery Pit, this
4 will involve moving water from the Jay Pit into the
5 Misery Pit. And for Panda and Koala, it involves
6 putting fine processed kimberlite into the Panda and
7 Koala Pits.

8 Given that there is this change, or
9 proposed change, does the Jay Project affect Dominion's
10 ability to meet the established closure objectives and
11 how confident are you about this?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
16 Dominion Diamond. With respect to the closure plan for
17 -- for Ekati and some of those elements, that the
18 closure objectives are -- are the closure objectives,
19 we expected to meet them. Some of the specific
20 reclamation activities may change as a result of the
21 Jay Project coming online. Thank you.

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,

1 with the Board. So we appreciate that Dominion will
2 make the attempt to meet the closure objectives and the
3 closure objectives aren't changing. The second part of
4 that question relates to confidence about the ability
5 to meet those closure objectives.

6 So specifically for the Misery Pit,
7 Dominion's proposed a water management plan of
8 establishing a meromictic pit lake. And parties have
9 suggested that they're still concerned about this water
10 management plan for closure.

11 So, first of all, with the confidence, I
12 guess, confirm that you're confident that you can meet
13 the closure objectives for Misery -- Misery Pit Lake.

14 And related to that, for Misery Pit
15 specifically, are there other examples of what can be
16 done for a contingency to meet those closure objectives
17 beyond a freshwater cap?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
22 Dominion Diamond. So two (2) parts to that question, I
23 think, Sachi. First, whether we have confidence that
24 we can meet the closure objectives. And -- and we do
25 have confidence that's -- that's, you know, that's why

1 we've developed the plan, because we do have that
2 confidence.

3 The second issue relates to
4 contingencies. First of all, I'd say that we -- we
5 think that the freshwater cap is -- is the preferred
6 approach to deal with. What we've also committed to is
7 an optimization study that would allow us to -- to look
8 at ways to ensure that that -- that that occurs. Thank
9 you.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Hi, it's Sachi De
14 Souza, with the Board. So as of right now for closure
15 there are no other contingencies, aside for the
16 freshwater cap?

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: And, sorry, this
21 is Sachi De Souza. Just to clarify, this is
22 specifically for the Misery pit right now.

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
2 Dominion Diamond. So as I -- as I said earlier in --
3 in response to an earlier question, we believe the
4 freshwater cap is -- is the most appropriate mechanism.
5 And -- and the modelling that we've done shows -- shows
6 that.

7 In addition, there -- there will be
8 required a final Closure Plan two (2) years prior to
9 closure, I believe. And it's -- it's at that stage,
10 you know, we determine if -- if other contingencies are
11 -- are required. And that's -- that's the process.
12 Thank you.

13 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: It's Sachi De
14 Souza, with the Board. Part of your previous answer
15 also related to an optimization study for the
16 freshwater cap. And I was hoping you could define that
17 a little bit better.

18 With respect to an optimization study
19 what part -- in particular are you optimizing for?
20 What are the objectives and the goals of that
21 optimization study for the Misery pit freshwater cap
22 for Misery pit stability?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
2 Golder Associates. The optimization study is going to
3 be driven primarily by the operational data that we
4 collect through project -- through the operations of
5 the project in Misery pit.

6 It's going to -- it's going to evaluate,
7 track the water quality conditions, and feed back into
8 an Adaptive Management Plan that will inform first the
9 need to adjust the freshwater cap, as a result of -- as
10 a result of the operational data. And if so, inform
11 what specifically that freshwater cap depth needs to
12 be. And ultimately the -- the key driver to that is
13 the ability -- well, the -- the meeting of the closure
14 objectives in terms of water quality conditions in
15 Misery pit.

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: It's Sachi De
20 Souza, with the Board. So now moving on to the closure
21 objectives for the Panda and Koala pits, which will
22 receive the fine processed kimberlite. To con --
23 you've stated that your intent is to meet the same
24 closure objectives for that.

25 Is the -- is part of that an intent to

1 reconnect Panda and Koala to Kodiak Lake?

2

3 (BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
6 Dominion Diamond. Currently, the plan is to connect
7 Kodiak and Panda -- or Panda and Koala to Kodiak, and
8 that will remain the plan through the operation of JN
9 through closure.

10 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
11 with the Board. Given that the plan is to reconnect to
12 Kodiak Lake, what evidence or what can Dominion provide
13 in terms of confidence to parties and the Board that
14 they can achieve tho -- those objectives?

15 Are there water quality predictions for
16 what Panda and Koala's overflow to Kodiak Lake will
17 look like at closure?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
22 Dominion Diamond. So we are currently putting
23 processed kimberlite into Beartooth Pit, of which are
24 collecting information on to see what this looks like.

25 We also are -- have in place or have

1 talked about a 30 -- 30-metre cap. And we will have
2 again operational monitoring in place and data
3 collected to inform how that is -- is looking. And --
4 and we -- we will be meeting our closure objectives as
5 stated the -- before. Thank you. Claudine Lee,
6 Dominion.

7 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
8 with the Board. So we appreciate that Beartooth is
9 currently being used for -- for putting the fine-
10 processed kimberlite. And there were questions about
11 this as the technical session.

12 So a couple of -- of questions here is -
13 - is, first of all, when will the data for Beartooth be
14 available? And will it be available prior to when the
15 fine-processed kimberlite needs to be placed into the
16 Panda and Koala Pit?

17 And related to that, if the -- the data
18 from Beartooth demonstrates that the fine-processed
19 kimberlite being placed into mined-out pits doesn't
20 result in water quality that meets closure objectives,
21 what is the contingency plan? Where would the fine-
22 processed kimberlite go if Beartooth proves potentially
23 unfeasible?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1

2

MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,

3

Dominion Diamond. The current plan for Beartooth is

4

for it to be closed in 2019 from use. Data or results

5

from there may come out in stages between now and then.

6

We don't have a time line for that. It depends on

7

operational monitoring collection of data.

8

We did commit to within this process

9

putting together an operational plan for Panda/Koala

10

during the Water Board water licence process. And as a

11

contingency, one (1) of the options, if -- if needed to

12

be considered, could be the use of Cell D in the Long

13

Lake Containment Facility, which is already approved in

14

the Wastewater Processed Kimberlite Management Plan

15

approved by the Water Board.

16

Claudine Lee, Dominion Diamond.

17

18

(BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20

DR. KATHY RACHER: Kathy Racher, for

21

the Board. We're going to take turns beating you up,

22

so. Just to follow up to that. We talked about the

23

optimization study for Misery. The original

24

commitment, I think, that you made for an optimization

25

study to the GNWT was with respect to Panda and Koala.

1 And we just wanted to confirm with you
2 what your objectives are for that study, what you're
3 hoping to learn and what the time frame is for that
4 study if that relates to Claudine's answer on the last
5 question perhaps.

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
10 Dominion Diamond. So those two (2) different
11 commitments that we're talking about here, I think the
12 objectives of the studies would be -- would be largely
13 -- largely the same in order to meet our closure
14 objectives, that the time lines may be a bit different.
15 So the time lines on the Panda and Koala
16 would be to provide the results of that optimization
17 study to the Board before we begin putting kim --
18 processed kimberlite into the Panda and Koala Pits.
19 Thank you.

20 Sorry, the Water Board. Sorry.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 DR. KATHY RACHER: Kathy Racher, for
25 the Board. So just to clarify, you were saying in the

1 last answer that you expect the results from Beartooth
2 to be available 2019 and -- so the -- the optimization
3 study for Panda and Koala doesn't necessarily need the
4 results from a fully closed Beartooth Pit then?

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 MR. RICHARD BARGER: Richard Barger,
9 Dominion Diamond. Just to clarify, I -- I think what
10 Claudine said was that Beartooth closes in 2019. We
11 get results in stages. And -- and so we'd have results
12 between now and 2019 that could feed in and -- and help
13 inform the optimization study.

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 DR. KATHY RACHER: Kathy Racher, for
18 the Board. So this morning we heard discussions about
19 the mine water management strategy for the mine. And
20 specifically, you highlighted the importance of
21 operational flexibility based on monitoring data that
22 you were collecting over time.

23 And you also mentioned, for example,
24 that you haven't precluded wanting to discharge water
25 from Misery to Lac du Sauvage prior to year 5. The

1 GNWT suggested year 3. You haven't precluded that as a
2 -- as a potential.

3 And that makes sense, but it does leave
4 the Board with a little bit of an information gap
5 because the modelling that you have presented -- and
6 you have done a number of models, we appreciate that --
7 for Lac de -- Lac de Gras water quality, all the models
8 have been done with the assumption that discharge from
9 Jay and discharge from Diavik won't overlap.

10 And so now, you know, we're seeing that
11 there's a possibility that they -- that they will. And
12 I don't necessarily see that as a problem, but we --
13 it's a little information gap that we don't -- we don't
14 know what the water quality in Lac de Gras would look
15 like if they did overlap.

16 And we're wondering if you could provide
17 us with an analysis of that scenario.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
22 Dominion Diamond. So, I mean, we're -- we were trying
23 to answer a question from the GNWT at the time. I
24 think we've been clear that we don't think it's
25 preferable to discharge in year 3. That's why we've

1 modelled it on discharge on -- on year 5.

2 What we -- what we're trying to say is
3 that the flexibility in the plan is -- is a good thing.
4 And -- and once we begin to get operational data, that
5 flexibility allows us to adaptively manage water in
6 future.

7 But we think that what we've modelled is
8 the appropriate -- appropriate scenario. And so I
9 think that that's -- you know, that -- that's the
10 answer from -- from our perspective anyway.

11 DR. KATHY RACHER: Kathy Racher, for
12 the Board. But would you agree that if you were
13 discharging at the same time as Diavik, you would
14 expect concentrations in Lac de Gras to be higher than
15 what you've modelled?

16 I suspect, from knowing the numbers,
17 that it won't -- that it -- it won't be significant,
18 but we haven't seen that. And now, you know, we're --
19 we're -- we -- the only modelling data we have doesn't
20 give us that scenario, doesn't check that box that
21 we've done our due diligence to say that if -- if the
22 Mine Water Management Plan changes because of adaptive
23 management, which is what you've highlighted again and
24 again that you -- you need that flexibility.

25 But we haven't seen what the effect on

1 Lac de Gras would be, which is why, I think, we're
2 asking for some sort of worse -- I don't know what the
3 modelling would entail, but some sort of worse case
4 just to check the box that says, Yes, if -- if we
5 discharge at the same time as Diavik the effect to Lac
6 de Gras would be...

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
11 Dominion Diamond. So I -- I just want to reiterate
12 that we don't see this as a preferable scenario. And I
13 think we've said that now repeatedly.

14 I suppose if the modelling was required
15 to be done, these -- these are complex models that --
16 that take some time to run, we could commit to
17 providing that modelling information at -- during the
18 permitting stage. But it would take some time to -- to
19 do that.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23

24 DR. KATHY RACHER: Kathy Racher, for
25 the Board. I think we're going to think about that, so

1 we'll get back to you as to whether we have a -- a
2 request as well later.

3 In the meantime, in -- in several of
4 your responses you've -- you've -- you have reiterated
5 that the discharge from the Misery pit will not be
6 acutely toxic. And you've never said acutely toxic to
7 what. So you've committed to doing acute toxicity
8 testing, I believe, on daphnia and on rainbow trout.

9 And I just wanted to confirm that you're
10 -- when you say the discharge won't be acutely toxic,
11 you are talking about at least those two (2) organisms
12 that you have recommended to -- to test in the
13 discharge.

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MS. CLAUDINE LEE: Claudine Lee,
18 Dominion Diamond. Yes, that's correct. We would -- we
19 would include those two (2) species, as well as
20 continuing with the engagement during the permitting
21 process on the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program.

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson,

1 for the Board. Just a couple easier questions to get
2 started on. In slide 28 this morning you talked about
3 operational monitoring of the Sub-Basin B Diversion
4 Channel for fish habitat purposes. And you were
5 committed to do this.

6 My question is: Do you see this
7 monitoring occurring under the regulation of DFO as
8 part of your fisheries authorization, or by the
9 Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board under the water
10 licence?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
15 Associates. It'd be under DFO's authorization.

16 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson,
17 for the Board. Thank you. And I'm sure Wek'eezhii
18 Land and Water Board thank you, too. I -- just a -- a
19 point of clarification from your response to the
20 Yellowknives Dene First Nation question this morning.

21 I believe I heard you say that in the
22 event of a catastrophic breakdown of meromixis, that
23 the pit -- Misery Pit would restratify, or the Jay Pit
24 would restratify.

25 Did I hear that correctly and could you

1 describe how that might occur?

2

3 (BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MR. MICHAEL HERRELL: It's Mike
6 Herrell, from Golder Associates. So I -- I'd like to
7 start saying that I -- this is going to be a conceptual
8 answer based on my understanding of the -- of -- of the
9 -- the project itself.

10 In response to the -- the question this
11 morning about the catastrophic overturn, I'm not sure I
12 like the word 'catastrophic', but I'll just use
13 'overturn', we referred that we -- we did do an
14 analysis of this as part of an Information Request.
15 And this actually came from MVEIRB. It was DAR MVEIRB
16 IR II-24.

17 And as part of that IR, what we looked
18 at were a few scenarios of where the -- the pits
19 overturned. So we looked at -- we did an assessment of
20 the water quality in Lac du Sauvage and Lac de Gras for
21 an overturned Misery Pit and overturned Jay Pit, and
22 also for an overturned -- overturning the both of -- of
23 the pits.

24 And an outcome of that was, even when
25 those pits overturned, there wasn't any significant

1 adverse effects to surface water quality at the
2 assessment locations that were considered.

3 As for your question on how the lake
4 could restratify, once the pits overturn, in the -- the
5 Jay Pit, it'll be fully mixed. However, the tap
6 doesn't switch off at that point in time, so there will
7 still be flows through the dike, freshwater flow, which
8 will have a residence time in -- in the upper layer of
9 the pit.

10 So there'll be a fleshing of the upper
11 layer of the pit from natural catchment runoff, also
12 lake water making its way into the diked off area. And
13 that'll create another stratification of -- of
14 different densities of the -- the upper and the lower
15 layers, causing stratification. But just to be clear,
16 that's a conceptual answer. We haven't actually done
17 that analysis to say to what extent they would
18 restratify.

19 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson,
20 for the Board. Thank you. And -- and sorry, I -- I
21 apologize for using the term 'catastrophic'.

22 I -- I guess there's lots of -- some
23 academic debate on how lateral transmission of
24 freshwater would reestablish a vertical stratification,
25 but -- so I think we just have to leave that answer

1 where it is and move on to the next.

2 We've talked a bit about cumulative
3 effects water quality model. One (1) of the issues
4 that's been raised by Diavik is the impact of discharge
5 from the Jay operations on their ability to meet
6 closure objectives for their own project.

7 I just want to ask you if you think that
8 you've developed a cumulative effects model that looks
9 at inputs from both projects. Could you use this model
10 to separate out the influence of your project from the
11 influence of the Diavik project on water quality at
12 select locations in Lac de Gras.

13 Is that feasible?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
18 Dominion Diamond. We -- I think we believe the -- the
19 answer to that question, Neil, is -- is yes, we can.

20 But it's important to note that, in the
21 recommendations in the -- the technical report from --
22 from Diavik, we've agreed to engagement on a mutually
23 agreeable monitoring plan going forward as well that
24 would -- would help inform that -- or provide some of
25 that data. Thank you.

1 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson,
2 for the Board. Yes, that was my next question, that
3 you -- you have agreed to -- to work on a monitoring
4 program for that. I would stress, though, that the
5 monitoring program results need to be compared to -- to
6 predictions as well to -- to interpret the effects.

7 Neil Hutchinson, from the Board. I have
8 one (1) more question on -- on models. Dominion
9 Diamonds have proposed adaptive management through the
10 water licence process and the AEMP to address
11 uncertainties in their water model and variance in
12 their predictions.

13 You've used a series of models to make
14 predictions for -- for your hydrody -- dynamic model.
15 You've used the conservative model from the DAR report,
16 you've used a reasonable estimate model, you've used a
17 lower-bound model.

18 Any response framework or adaptive
19 management plan that's developed will need to be based
20 on water quality triggers, on comparison of monitoring
21 results to predictions in order to trigger an adaptive
22 management response.

23 So what model would Dominion Diamonds
24 recommend that they use for the development of these
25 triggers in the AEMP and the adaptive management

1 process?

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
6 Golder Associates. A -- a good question, Neil. I
7 think I -- I -- the -- the most appropriate model to
8 use moving forward at this stage is the reasonable
9 estimate case.

10

And -- and why I -- why I -- we
11 recommend that is -- is a function that it provides
12 more conservatism around any thresholds that would be
13 developed for triggers as part of the -- as part of the
14 water licensing or AEMP, you know, for example.

15

What -- what can then happen as
16 operational data comes into play is it -- it allows for
17 updates if necessary to that modelling that can be also
18 considered in terms of setting of any thresholds.

19

But the answer at this stage in time,
20 due to the conservatism that it provides, would be that
21 the reasonable estimate case would be -- would be a
22 good starting point.

23

DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson,
24 for the Board. Thank you. That's all my questions.

25

MR. ALAN EHRLICH: My name's Alan

1 Ehrlich, for the Board. I'm -- I'm not going to ask
2 you technically detailed, gruelling questions of the
3 sort you've been dealing with all morning.

4 I'm going to ask you stuff that has more
5 to do with very directly what the Board's decision is.
6 The Board has to make determinations about the
7 potential significance of likely adverse impacts.

8 I'm going to talk a bit about -- I only
9 have two (2) questions. One (1) is about the fish-out.
10 Dominion has predicted that its proposed fish-out will
11 remove 3.6 percent of the fish in Lac du Sauvage.

12 Now, based on the high end of your
13 estimate of the population range for that lake, this
14 would kill up to -- and that's the maximum -- thirty
15 thousand (30,000) fish approximately.

16 Now, I understand that you're not going
17 to waste the fish. You've got plans to share it with
18 communities and -- and that kind of thing. But with
19 regards to the killing up to thirty thousand (30,000)
20 fish, please explain to the Board why you believe that
21 this is not a significant impact.

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder

1 Associates. I'd just like to clarify some of those
2 numbers.

3 Whatever density estimate we use, it's
4 still 3.6 percent of the population. So if we use the
5 -- the median statistic, I believe there is going to be
6 -- there's -- there's a prediction of about two hundred
7 thousand (200,000) fish in the lake; 3.6 percent of
8 that would be approximately seven thousand (7,000)
9 fish.

10 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: Elliot Holland --

11 MR. CAM STEVENS: Let me keep going.
12 It's -- oh, sorry. One (1) -- one (1) other statistic.

13 If we use the 75th percentile, that's
14 eight hundred thousand (800,000) fish. And then 3.6
15 percent of that is, I think, twenty-four thousand
16 (24,000) or -- or something to that effect.

17 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: Elliot Holland,
18 for Dominion. I would just add on to that that's the -
19 - that's the -- the fish-out that we'll have.

20 We're -- we're fairly sure that our --
21 that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will --
22 will require a -- an offsetting scheme to -- to
23 mitigate that impact. And the -- the goal of that
24 offsetting scheme will be to -- to -- again, to -- to
25 offset any impact that we do -- do have. So the, you

1 know, the residual impact based on DFO's process is --
2 is designed to be -- to be negligible.

3 I -- I would also say that, you know,
4 we've done this process very successfully this -- this
5 year at the Lynx Lake. We can report that both our
6 engagement process with the communities and our -- our
7 -- the process we went through with DFO, you know,
8 resulted in a very successful fish offset that -- that
9 we're very proud of. And -- and we'd intend to -- to
10 take many of those lessons learned on to -- to Jay.

11 MR. ALAN EHRLICH: That helps, and
12 leads brilliantly into my second question.

13 Can you please explain to the Board how
14 the offsetting that you've just described affects your
15 view of the aquatic impact significance? In other
16 words, besides the basic legal requirement of DFO, why
17 do you consider this offsetting to be an appropriate
18 action for impacts that you can't minimize or avoid?

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. ELLIOT HOLLAND: Elliot Holland,
23 for Dominion. First, we will -- just want to clarify
24 that the -- the impact on the lake itself, we've --
25 we've assessed to be not significant.

1 And -- and that's on -- on the basis of
2 the -- the statistics and the analysis that -- that Cam
3 mentioned. You know, however, we know there -- there
4 will be a -- an impact on Lac du Sauvage from our
5 activities. And, you know, the reason we're -- we're
6 quite comfortable with DFO's process for offsetting is
7 because, I mean, first of all, it's -- it's an
8 established regulatory mechanism.

9 Second of all, it's -- it's been used
10 many times at -- at the site, including recently. In -
11 - in our view, to the satisfaction of -- of the parties
12 involved.

13 And, you know, lastly, it -- it provides
14 a enhanced habitat in culturally significant areas for
15 -- for communities. And therefore, it's a -- you know,
16 we believe it's -- it's an appropriate mechanism for us
17 to use going forward.

18 MR. ALAN EHRLICH: Thank you very much.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from Board
20 members?

21 MR. JOHN CURRAN: Thank you. John
22 Curran, Review Board.

23 You were talking earlier about the --
24 the narrows. What is the depth, or the average depth,
25 of the narrows, just so that we have a better idea of

1 that? Thank you.

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

MR. CAM STEVENS: Just one (1) second,

6

Madam Chair.

7

8

(BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10

MR. CAM STEVENS: It's Cam Stevens,

11

with Golder Associates. Just hand on a sec. We have -

12

- the -- the stream length is 210 metres, the bank full

13

width is 45 metres, and the -- and the wedded width is

14

very similar, but wedded width depends on time of the

15

year.

16

And I need two (2) more minutes to find

17

the statistic.

18

MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Apparently that

19

sheet has everything except the depths, so.

20

21

(BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23

MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Madam Chair,

24

rather than sort of -- sort of waste time here, why --

25

why don't we come back with the -- with the -- the

1 depth. And we'll let Cam find it in -- you know, in --
2 in one (1) of our responses here, and -- and have
3 everyone look at him while he's trying to find it.

4 MR. JOHN CURRAN: Okay. Yeah. Just
5 one (1) other question as well. I think you'd talked
6 earlier about a -- a 98 percent chance that the two (2)
7 populations of fish are connected. And I thought I'd
8 seen in some of the -- in the TK reports, talk of the
9 narrows being a key fishing point.

10 And I'm just wondering if -- if using TK
11 might fill in the other 2 percent, that those
12 populations of fish are moving through the narrows.

13 MR. RICHARD BARGER: Richard Barger,
14 Dominion Diamond. Yes, I -- I think Cam mentioned
15 this, but I think that that's -- that's an important
16 consideration that TK does tell us that fish do move
17 between -- between the two (2) lakes through the
18 narrows.

19 So, yes, we would agree with that, and,
20 yes, give us even greater certainty. Thank you.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Question from Board
25 member? And you're still looking for the information

1 for the depth, right?

2

3 (BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Good afternoon,
6 it's Bertha Norwegian. I just want to touch a bit on
7 the questions that were asked of our staff regarding
8 Lac de -- de Gras. Can you hear me? Oh. Yeah. More
9 mics, please.

10 Bertha Norwegian, Board member. Sorry
11 about that. I just wanted to touch on one (1) of the
12 questions, or two (2) of the questions, actually, that
13 were asked by our staff regarding Lac de Gras.

14 I've got a document here that was
15 provided to you by Diavik Diamond. And I just want to
16 touch base on the first sentence on the fifth page,
17 fourth paragraph:

18 "The use of Lac de Gras for waste
19 assimilation is predicted to increase
20 with the development of the Jay
21 Project."

22 Can you tell us a little bit about what
23 kind of wastes we're talking about? Are we talking
24 about only chloride or mercury, methane? I mean, I'm
25 not really sure. I wonder if you could provide us with

1 that info. Thank you.

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
6 Golder Associates. The -- the modelling that has been
7 undertaken for -- for the project, the cumu --
8 cumulative effects portion of the project quite rightly
9 does -- does account for how the Jay Project activities
10 do contribute to the -- the changes in water quality
11 from Lac du Sauvage to Lac de Gras.

12 And the principle sources of input to
13 that change in Lac de Gras are effectively the Misery
14 Pit discharge that occurs in the latter period of time
15 with respect to the project operation, the Jay Project
16 operation. It also includes a -- a proportion of waste
17 rock storage area runoff that makes its way into Lac de
18 Sauvage, and then into -- to Lac de Gras.

19 They're -- they're the -- they're the
20 two (2) key inputs to Lac de Gras from a cumulative
21 effects point of view during operations. During
22 closure there -- there is also Misery Pit inflow that
23 goes directly to Lac de Gras. And there's also the --
24 there's also the reconnection of the Jay Pit to -- to
25 Lac du Sauvage.

1 So -- so they're the principle
2 components that -- that provide a cumulative
3 incremental change to -- to Lac de Gras. And, you
4 know, I -- I think also, as -- as what we've discussed
5 this morning with regard to -- to the -- the Mine Water
6 Management Plan, all of those aspects have been
7 considered in terms of -- of Dominion's commitment to
8 minimizing the potential impacts to the receiving
9 environment, which include the cumulative effects to
10 Lac de Gras.

11 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Thank you very
12 much. So what exactly -- what type of wastes are we
13 talking about, do we know?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. JOHN FAITHFUL: John Faithful,
18 Golder Associates. So the -- the primary composition
19 of the waste based on those source inputs is going to
20 be related to water quality. And we have a fairly
21 substantial influence on that water quality by the
22 groundwater management.

23 And so with groundwater -- it's -- it's
24 primary groundwater constituents that -- total
25 dissolved solids that are going to comprise major ions

1 that include chloride and calcium, sulphate. And there
2 will be other constituents that -- that -- trace
3 metals, for example, which are consistent with -- with
4 that material present in -- currently in Lac du Sauvage
5 and Lac de Gras.

6 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Thank you very
7 much. No more questions.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Just for Dominion,
9 did you find the depth?

10 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery.

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Potentially. I
15 could make a joke that it's over my head, but -- but
16 hopefully -- all right. Yes.

17 MR. CAM STEVENS: Cam Stevens, Golder
18 Associates. Thanks for your patience. So we have a --
19 we've -- we've done a number of profiles across the --
20 across the channel. And during -- some variability in
21 flows by about 60 to 80 centimetres over the course of
22 -- of a season, but the depths seem to be, on average
23 around about a metre in depth.

24 And depending on the season, it's --
25 it's a bit higher than that or a bit lower than -- low

1 -- lower than that. Some part of the channels are
2 wadable. Other -- other parts of the channel, you
3 cannot wade across. The -- the most depth would be
4 approximately about a metre and a half, metre, metre
5 and a half, 1.3 metres, to be exact.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. We
7 would like to start with the presentations now, and we
8 would ask the -- IEMA to -- you could either sit at the
9 table or probably come up. Would you like to come up?
10 You're right at the front anyway.

11 You could do it right at your table,
12 since you're right at the front there. Yeah.

13

14 PRESENTATION BY IEMA:

15 MR. BILL ROSS: Here we go. Thank you,
16 Madam Chair. My name is Bill Ross. I'm the chair of
17 the Independent Environmental Monitoring Agency. And
18 as soon as Kevin flips to the next slide, we will see
19 that our presentation -- there we go -- starts with
20 service water and mine water management.

21 I -- I will now simply turn it over to
22 Emery Paquin, who will deal with -- with that. And at
23 some point shortly thereafter, he will turn it over to
24 Tim Byers. Emery...?

25 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Thank you. Emery

1 Paquin, with the Monitoring Agency. And given the time
2 of day, I -- I will do my best to be brief.

3 So Section 7.3.1.1 of the terms of
4 reference requires the Company to describe and evaluate
5 contingent water treatment alternatives during all
6 phases, including the use of Lynx and Misery Pits,
7 mechanical, and other water treatment options.

8 As we heard this morning, the Company is
9 confident their water management approach using
10 meromixis will be successful. The Monitoring Agency at
11 this point cannot state whether meromixis will or will
12 not occur in the Misery and the Jay Pit.

13 The Agency is concerned that, in the
14 event that meromixis -- meromictic conditions do not
15 become established, or if they become interrupted, then
16 the implementation of the adaptive management
17 strategies identified by the Company would require
18 sufficient lead time to plan and implement.

19 At this time, there are no specific
20 triggers or timeline -- time frames for early warning
21 or actions that would have to be provided by the
22 Applicant.

23 The agency wishes to acknowledge
24 Dominion Diamond's response to our measure in its
25 August technical report responses. In this response,

1 Dominion states it expects that a revised mine water
2 management plan will need to be submitted to the
3 Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board.

4 It further states that the plan will
5 include details of contingencies, monitoring and
6 evaluation, trigger thresholds, timelines for
7 implementation, and that the revised plan would be
8 provided to the Land and Water Board for approval
9 within two (2) years of dewatering of the Jay Pit. Or
10 actually, to clarify, within two (2) years of
11 dewatering being initiated.

12 The Monitoring Agency believes that
13 should the anticipated meromixis state fail to be
14 established, it is likely that effluent quality
15 standards would not be achieved, significant impacts to
16 water quality in Lac du Sauvage may result, and the
17 effective and timely impen -- implementation of a
18 adaptive management contingencies would be required in
19 order to protect the waters of Lac du Sauvage and Lac
20 de Gras.

21 Therefore, the agency requests that the
22 Review Board make the commitment that Dominion has made
23 that a updated Mine Water Management Plan will be
24 submitted. We request that the Review Board make this
25 a regular -- regulatory requirement of the Wek'eezhii

1 Land and Water Board. And with that, I will turn the
2 mic over to my colleague. Thanks.

3 MR. TIM BYERS: First of all, our
4 apologies for the -- sorry. Tim Byers, with the
5 Monitoring Agency. First of all, our apologies for the
6 typo in the -- in the title there. It -- we all know
7 it's Lac du Sauvage, not Lac du Savauge.

8 So, anyways, Dominion plans on
9 monitoring only small fish species, such as sculpin,
10 for -- during their AEMP, rather than the larger
11 whitefish and trout for the reasons that impacts on the
12 small sculpin will show up well before contaminant
13 impacts emerge in the larger species higher up the food
14 chain.

15 Dominion also wants to avoid killing
16 large fish of value to the Aboriginal communities,
17 which is a noble objective to obtain biological and
18 contaminants info. However, we're concerned that
19 contaminant loading may be massed by the short life
20 span of sculpins, and may remain undetected in older
21 trout which live, in the case of trout, over -- well
22 over twenty (20) years, and bioaccumulate things like
23 mercury over that time span.

24 I would like to take this opportunity to
25 correct something in the agency technical report. We

1 stated that the life span of a sculp -- a slimy sculpin
2 is only three (3) to four (4) years, but that was the
3 average age of sculpin disco -- found in the -- in the
4 monitoring of the -- the other lakes. The actual life
5 span is up to ten (10) years.

6 Large species that live for a long time,
7 such as lake trout and burbot, can naturally accumulate
8 mercury in their bodies that surpass Health Canada
9 guidelines for safe eating. The Adaptive Management
10 Plan for this mine includes heavy metals such as
11 mercury in fish muscle and internal organs, like liver,
12 as something that is measured and should have, for
13 adaptive management, an early warning of impending
14 health risks for fish consumers of those fish, as well
15 as human consumers.

16 It's important to have this system in
17 place in -- sorry. It's important to have a system in
18 place that addresses Aboriginal concerns about these
19 type of risks from contaminants. A measure that
20 incorporates non-lethal sampling of large fish in Lac
21 du Sauvage can address Dominion's concerns about
22 possible harm to trout populations from sampling them.

23 In fact, Dominion is already doing this
24 in the smaller lakes in the current AEMP, where they
25 can take a plug of skin and muscle from a live fish and

1 not kill the entire fish, and apparently the -- the
2 fish live happily ever after, or we hope they do.

3 We note that technical reports from the
4 NWT and Can -- Canadian governments also stress the
5 importance of monitoring the larger species. The DAR
6 focusses on impacts on water quality only from dust
7 deposition over Lac du Sauvage from the mine rather
8 than effects also on the lake bottom.

9 The Company believes that potential
10 impacts on fish reproduction will not occur from dust
11 deposition over -- or potential dust deposition over
12 fish shoals due to wave action sweeping away that dust
13 sediment that may settle on the fish shoals. But the
14 agency does not believe DDEC, Dominion Diamonds, has
15 proven beyond a doubt that dust produced by its Jay
16 mine will not adversely impact trout and whitefish
17 spawning beds.

18 Dominion predicts that dust produced at
19 the perimeter, so the outside edges, of the Jay Pit
20 would reach a maximum deposition rate of 5.12
21 milligrams per decimetre -- I never knew how to
22 pronounce that word -- but decimetre per day. Research
23 by fisheries biologists show that if sediment
24 accumulates over whitefish spawning beds in the range
25 of only 1/3 to 1.4 milligrams per decimetre, this can,

1 in fact, create a signi -- a significant impact to egg
2 survival.

3 As well, the agency is unsure of
4 Dominion's contention that any dust deposited on
5 spawning beds will be swept away by waves. We note
6 that -- or at least the DAR notes that spawning shoals
7 in Lac du Sauvage are 2 to 6 metres below the -- below
8 the surface.

9 And the average wave height in the lake
10 is a 1/3 to 7/10 of a metre high. So it is not clear
11 to the agency -- none of us are hydro -- or
12 hydrologists. It is not clear to the agency, given the
13 evidence in the DAR and their supporting documents,
14 that this wave height could create the depth of
15 turbulence below the water surface of the lake to reach
16 the dusted shoals, nor do we know where lake currents
17 are located and their direction of flow in relation to
18 those shoals.

19 I -- I am not at all sure whether wave
20 turbulence and lake currents that Dominion is telling
21 us will sweep away dust -- sediment, rather, whether
22 they will be sufficient to suck out, if you will,
23 particles from interstitial spaces within the gravel.
24 So in other words, a trout will -- will lay the eggs
25 over a gravel bed. Many, or if not most, of those eggs

1 will fall within the spaces between gravel.

2 And so if dust or other type of sediment
3 does settle within those spaces, can it literally
4 suffocate eggs and the alevins, that is, the baby fish
5 that still have their yolk attached and haven't emerged
6 from the gravel yet? We believe that Dominion should
7 present a model of depth of wave turbulence to support
8 their argument that dust will be naturally swept off
9 spawning shoals.

10 Our next topic of concern is reference
11 lakes. Counts Lake is a reference lake used in the
12 current AEMP, Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program, as a
13 gauge of natural lake conditions which are supposed to
14 be untouched by mining. But we learned from the DAR
15 that dust produced by the Jay Project is expected to
16 increase suspended sediment in Counts Lake.

17 So the Company has stated that it will
18 determine through their AEMP monitoring whether Counts
19 Lake will continue to be suitable as a reference lake,
20 which is good for us to know. But this does not
21 venture to predict whether the Company expects this
22 lake to continue to provide pristine conditions that
23 the current AEMP requires. So Jay -- the Jay Project
24 should not disrupt the integrity of the current AEMP,
25 which is designed to identify environmental changes and

1 their source.

2 The Jay Project would increase total
3 suspended solids above historic levels in a lake that
4 is supposed to be untouched. So two (2) -- well, no
5 suitable reference lakes for Jay have yet been proposed
6 in the DAR or the AEMP design plan, and possible
7 impacts on Counts Lake from Jay-generated dust have not
8 been considered.

9 So our recommended measure, then,
10 Dominion has -- Dominion should evaluate the Jay
11 Project's impacts on Counts Lake as a -- an AEMP
12 reference lake. They have stated that a desktop
13 reference lake study will be conducted for the project
14 to identify whether a suitable reference lake can be
15 found for comparisons to Lac du Sauvage in addition to
16 the three (3) currently, which counts as one (1).

17 So the agency would be interested in
18 getting, if possible, a short list of the lakes being
19 considered in that reference lake study, and if this
20 could be provided to the Review Board and regulators,
21 we think that would be beneficial.

22 As we've heard a -- a couple times
23 earlier today, the Company has stated that Jay effluent
24 will never be acutely toxic to life in Lac du Sauvage,
25 and further states that data collected as part of the

1 monitoring program, that is the SNPs, the AEMP, would
2 be used to assess the need for adaptive management
3 strategies in the event that trends in surface water
4 and mine water quality differ from what they expect --
5 what the Company expects.

6 The agency is concerned that aquatic
7 life within that mixing zone could be exposed to
8 acutely toxic effluent. Cladocerans were predicted in
9 -- or, sorry, cladocerans in their tox testing --
10 toxicity testing were exposed to predicted Jay effluent
11 qual -- Jay effluent quality, and only 45 percent
12 survived the effluent. So this is a -- a significant
13 toxic effect, it would seem.

14 Also, in that same tox test -- toxicity
15 testing, there seems to have been a methodological
16 problem for the water flea particularly. Not so much
17 for -- for trout, but for the water flea, Daphnia,
18 which is a major prey of -- of fish species, I might
19 add, in the AEMP lakes. The laboratory test water was
20 warmer than the water normally found in Lac du Sauvage.

21 So under the Fisheries Act, acute
22 toxicity is not permissible at end-of-pipe discharge
23 point. And because of this, we believe Dominion should
24 determine how likely it is that effluent tox --
25 effluent that is toxic to zooplankton will be released

1 into the mixing zone in Lac du Sauvage.

2 We would like the Company to ensure that
3 any test conditions are representative of natural Lac
4 du Sauvage conditions so that the toxicity test results
5 are comparable to natural pre-mine conditions.

6 Onwards to zooplankton. The agency
7 fears that effluent from the Jay Project may result in
8 a shift in the dominant zooplankton species to species
9 that may not be edible to fish.

10 Dominion, on the other hand, does not
11 think any zooplankton changes caused by -- sorry, any
12 changes in the zooplankton community caused by mine
13 enflu -- effluent will be harmful to fish.

14 And the Company states that if a low
15 action level is triggered for plankton as part of their
16 AEMP response framework, determining how changes in
17 community -- community structure could ultimately
18 impact fish populations could be proposed as part of a
19 response plan.

20 However, we note that thresholds and
21 action levels within that response plan have yet to be
22 established for plankton community changes -- that is,
23 taxonomic changes. So we are left with no clear
24 indication that the Company will be capable of
25 determining impending adverse impacts to plankton

1 communities that fish rely on in these lakes.

2 The DAR does not recognize that
3 significant shifts in zooplankton community structure
4 can impact fish health through creating conditions for
5 poor nutrition. That is, if the -- the plankton change
6 so that there are too many inedible ones, you have less
7 food for fish.

8 Shifts in zooplankton communities caused
9 by either phytoplankton changes or water quality
10 degradation can impact the food that especially the
11 young fish eat.

12 Phosphorus, which is a plant nutrient,
13 is predicted to increase above the level at which Lac
14 du Sauvage will no longer be oligotrophic. This could
15 result in a greater biomass of phytoplankton. So in
16 other words, there'll be a lot more food for the
17 zooplankton higher up the chain to feed on.

18 So one would think intuitively that this
19 a benefit to the next community up the food chain --
20 that is, the zooplankton. However, along with
21 increasing biomass, there is the potential for changes
22 in the dominant species of that community.

23 If the change is more - if the change in
24 that community is from more edible species to more
25 inedible species of phytoplankton, then one can see

1 that this is a -- has the potential to reduce, not
2 increase, food for zooplankton.

3 And we're down to our last two (2)
4 slides. In fact, the current AEMP has -- has recently
5 shown significant declines in populations of two (2)
6 major parts of the zooplankton communities in lakes
7 downstream of the LLCF, the tailings pond, the Long
8 Lake Containment Facility.

9 For the record, these are rotifers and
10 cladocera have declined sharply. We're not sure
11 whether this decline in these two (2) major parts of
12 the communities of zooplankton is caused by
13 nutrification, or by high potassium concentration, or
14 higher TDS concentration.

15 That isn't exactly known yet, so we
16 cannot be certain whether the same significant impacts
17 to Lac du Sauvage zooplankton won't occur and, most
18 importantly, what impacts that would have on
19 planktivorous fish -- that is, fish that eat plankton
20 mostly -- such as whitefish and juvenile lake trout
21 that rely more on zooplankton than fish to eat.

22 And finally, we believe -- or we feel
23 that Dominion should show that it is willing to assess
24 plankton community changes every year. And it seems
25 that Dominion has, in its responses to reviewers,

1 committed to do this, which we're happy to see. But we
2 would also like to see that differential impacts up the
3 food chain to various fish species and also various
4 fish age classes.

5 So not just the adults, but also perhaps
6 the fry or juvenile fish. We believe those should be
7 part of the assessment. And with that, I think you
8 very much for your time.

9

10 QUESTION PERIOD:

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your
12 presentation. Questions from the Government of the
13 Northwest Territories?

14 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
15 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with Environment and
16 Natural Resources, Government of the Northwest
17 Territories. I just have three (3) questions for IEMA.
18 First off, thank you very much for your presentation
19 today.

20 I guess my first question is: Does IEMA
21 believe based on their technical assessment that
22 flexibility in Dominion Diamond's Water Management Plan
23 is required to avoid toxicity issues to plankton and
24 zooplankton?

25 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin, with

1 the Monitoring Agency. Predictions are -- are just
2 that, they're predictions. Model outputs are the
3 result of complex mathematical calculations based upon
4 certain initial input data. The -- the only way that
5 Dominion Diamonds or anybody can be assured of -- of
6 what is happening in the natural is -- environment is
7 by putting into place a robust monitoring program.

8 You asked whether the agenc -- the
9 Monitoring Agency believes that flexibility needs to be
10 built into the Water Management Plan. Definitely, yes.
11 Flexibility does need to be built into it, simply --
12 for the simple reason that right now, any conceptual
13 management plans are built upon predictions and model
14 results.

15 The other comment that I would like to
16 make now is that lead times are extremely important in
17 the -- when developing any water management plan. If
18 what is happening in the environment is -- differs from
19 the predictions or model outputs, you need sufficient
20 time in order to implement the contingencies.

21 So the simple answer to your question
22 is, yes, flexibility does need to be built in.

23 MR. NATHEN RICHA: Thank you, Madam
24 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, again, with ENR.

25 Just a quick follow-up. You mentioned

1 the monitoring, and I'm assuming adaptive management.
2 Does IEMA believe that adaptive management will be
3 required in the event that the EA conservative case
4 becomes a reality for Dominion Diamonds?

5 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin the --
6 Paquin, with the Monitoring Agency. Again, the short
7 answer is, yes.

8 Adaptive management will be required
9 whenever triggers are exceeded or regulatory
10 requirements are approached, regardless of -- of
11 whether you use the conservative case or any other
12 planning approach.

13 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
14 Chair. I just have one (1) final question. A preamble
15 to the question is, IEMA issued an Information Request
16 to --

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: State your name,
18 please.

19 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Sorry, it's Nathen
20 Richea, with Environment and Natural Resources. IEMA
21 issued an Information Request in the First Round of IRs
22 to all parties. I think the IR number was number 52.
23 It was specifically in regards to significance
24 determinations and the assessment end points.

25 I guess my question to IEMA is: Does

1 IEMA have any comments on the use of the assessment end
2 points and special -- spatial scales that have been
3 used to determine significance to value components by
4 the Developer in their project assessment?

5 MR. BILL ROSS: Bill Ross, Monitoring
6 Agency. There was a flurry of exchanges in the First
7 Round of IRs related to significance criteria, as I
8 would call them, or this assessment end points as -- as
9 Dominion Diamond calls them.

10 The most broad request came from the
11 Review Board in its IR number 77, and we replied to it.
12 Let me skip through much of it very quickly. We -- we
13 have no mandate to deal with socio-economic effects,
14 and so we won't comment on the end points used there.

15 We took strong issue with the suggestion
16 that -- I'm trying to find the right phrase again, here
17 -- self-sustaining and ecologically effective
18 populations as a -- as a suitable significance
19 criterion for wildlife for the -- for caribou and --
20 and the like. And we -- we indicated most importantly
21 that -- there and elsewhere, that societal values can
22 and should be used as a -- as an important tool in
23 determining significance.

24 The -- if -- if I focus more on water
25 quality and quantity, and on fish and fish habitat, I -

1 - let me read, because it's quite short, our response
2 at that time:

3 "Regarding water and -- water quality
4 and quantity, the agency was
5 surprised to see that continued and
6 future safe use of waters such as Lac
7 du Sauvage and Lac de Gras for
8 drinking water and domestic fisheries
9 were not identified as end points for
10 water quality. CCME and Health
11 Canada have developed measurement
12 indicators for safe water. With
13 respect to fish and fish habitat, the
14 agency suggested that DDEC should
15 include parasite inf -- infestation
16 rates and other health indices as
17 measurement indicators in its
18 assessment of -- of Jay."

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
23 Chair. I just have -- to discuss here. I'm not sure
24 if we need to rephrase the question or -- or what. But
25 I'll -- just a second, a quick second.

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
4 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, GNWT. Apologize for the
5 short pause there. I -- I guess to get back to the
6 question, I guess in a blunt way, does IEMA believe
7 that a more localized scale for impact assessment is
8 required, in that a measure may be required to limit
9 the extent of impact on local scales?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. BILL ROSS: Bill Ross, Monitoring
14 Agency. I -- sorry, I -- I misunderstood the question.
15 The spatial scale issue is something --
16 clearly differs for different valued components,
17 principle of impact assessment, I guess. And the scale
18 for Bathurst caribou, for example, I thought was quite
19 appropriate, it's a very large area.

20 On the other hand, if we're dealing with
21 fish or with water quality, the -- the effects may be
22 relatively local and focussing on dealing specifically
23 with local areas where there could be concerns would be
24 appropriate.

25 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam

1 Chair. It's Nathan Richea, ENR. We have no further
2 questions.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

4 Questions, Yellowknives Dene First Nation?

5 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power,
6 Yellowknives Dene First Nation. We have no questions.
7 Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Lutsel K'e
9 Dene First Nation.

10 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
11 K'e Dene First Nation. As mentioned yesterday and as
12 mentioned in our technical report, LKDFN is especially
13 concerned about the waste rock storage area and its
14 proximity to water bodies.

15 As the agency responsible for monitoring
16 Ekati, could IEMA please provide a brief assessment of
17 the management of Ekati's current waste rock piles?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. KEVIN O'REILLY: Thanks. Kevin
22 O'Reilly, on behalf of the agency.

23 I guess the agency has had a
24 longstanding concern with some of the current waste
25 rock piles, and at least a couple of them are not

1 freezing or freezing as predicted by the Company. And
2 there's limited thermal monitoring that's happening in
3 some of the waste rock piles, and we've suggested that
4 that be improved.

5 I guess more importantly, though, the
6 Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board has initiated a major
7 review of the current waste rock storage area
8 management by the Company. And there's an ecological
9 risk assessment that the Company is working on.
10 There's a thermal monitoring assessment they're working
11 on, and I may not get all of this right, but some
12 geotechnical -- or sorry, geochemical characterization
13 work and so on.

14 So there's sort of three (3) components
15 of that work that are going on. And I think they --
16 they've completed at least a first go-around on that
17 for the operations phase of the project, but there's
18 still work to be done on the closure phase.

19 In any event, the age -- the agency has
20 been involved in -- in that work that the Wek'eezhii
21 Land and Water Board has ongoing. We've made a number
22 of recommendations around waste rock storage area
23 management at the site for a number of years,
24 particularly, with regard to thermal monitoring. And
25 it seems to be -- I guess the Company's now addressing

1 some of that, so we -- we're -- we'll be very
2 interested to see the -- how that plays out. Thanks.

3 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
4 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. No further
5 questions. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
7 Questions, Tlicho Government?

8 MR. HENRY ZOE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
9 Henry Zoe, Tlicho Government. Well, I have a couple
10 questions for IEMA, and it's in regards to your
11 technical -- your report that you submitted.

12 You made a suggestion that Canada and
13 GNWT investigate, and publically report on the
14 establishment of our permin -- participating funding
15 program for environmental assessments held under Part 5
16 of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act within
17 one (1) year of the acceptance of the report of
18 environmental assessment.

19 We would like to comment that the lack
20 of funding has been a significant constraint to public
21 engagement, causing some groups to have -- some groups
22 to patch together funds from internal sources.

23 Our question to you is: What kind of a
24 consultation would you consider to be advisable in the
25 establishment of a partic -- participant funding

1 program? Thank you.

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

THE CHAIRPERSON: A reminder, please,
6 that the questions have to be directed to the scope of
7 the Project.

8

MR. BILL ROSS: Then I'll be very
9 succinct, Madam Chair. Bill Ross, Agency. The most
10 important thing is to get a funding program in place,
11 and a precursor to that would be a reasonable
12 consultation.

13

MR. HENRY ZOE: Thank you. I have one
14 (1) more further question, Madam Chair.

15

IEMA, I think -- I believe you're
16 recommending that the Review Board make a significant -
17 - make a finding of significant adverse impact, and it
18 seems implicit that you are suggesting a decision track
19 of assigning measures, and not suggesting that the
20 Review Board proceed to a full environmental impact
21 review.

22

However, we would like to ask for
23 clarification in this regard. Are you asking that the
24 Review Board to recommend that the approval of the
25 proposal be made subject to the imposition of such

1 measures as they consider necessary to prevent the
2 significant adverse impact? Thank you.

3 MR. BILL ROSS: Bill Ross, Agency.
4 Most importantly, the recommendation was that the
5 Review Board should find a significant adverse
6 cumulative effect on the Bathurst herd. In addition,
7 we identified some of the kinds of measures that could
8 be used to mitigate that significant adverse cumulative
9 effect, and others have commented on them.

10 The decision about whether those
11 measures are sufficient or not is in the hands of the
12 Review Board, and we would never suggest that we would
13 -- to tell them what to do there. They must find
14 whether they are sufficient, and the Review Board will
15 make that determination.

16 MR. HENRY ZOE: Thank you. No more
17 questions, Madam Chair.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from
19 Environment Canada?

20 MS. SARAH-LACEY MCMILLAN: Sarah-Lacey
21 McMillan, with Environment Canada. No questions.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fisheries
23 and Oceans Canada?

24 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
25 and Oceans Canada. I have two (2) questions.

1 In your presentation, you spoke to a
2 concern with using small-bodied fish to detect
3 contaminate loads. And I was just wondering if you
4 could clarify: Is the Agency suggesting that small
5 bodied fish not be used, or a combination of small
6 bodied fish with a -- what you referred to as the
7 tissue biopsies for the large bodied fish?

8 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you for -- sorry,
9 Tim Byers, with the Agency. Thank you for that
10 question.

11 Yes, we would definitely want to see
12 both the small bodied fish, which are lower on that
13 food chain, and the large bodied fish both be used,
14 especially for contaminates monitoring.

15 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
16 and Oceans. Thank you. My second question is related
17 to the use of tissue biopsies.

18 I've been an advocate for non-lethal
19 sampling for many years, and I'm aware that tissue
20 biopsies are successful for mercury, and they've been
21 successfully used to detect changes in mercury levels
22 in northern pike with reservoir creation.

23 I'm not aware of other parameters that a
24 tissue biopsy could be used for simply because there
25 isn't a lot of material. And for other analysis, you

1 need a lot more tissue than you can get through a
2 biopsy.

3 So I'm just wondering if the agency is
4 aware of advancements in the tissue biopsy methodology,
5 such that it can now be used for other parameters other
6 than mercury?

7 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
8 agency. No, actually, Julie, I'm not aware of -- of
9 such. I know fisheries consul -- fish consultant --
10 consulting friends of mine working on other projects
11 tell me that if they need, for example, a sample of
12 biopsy tissue from ten (10) trout, and they're looking
13 at three (3) different heavy metals, then they probably
14 want to take thirty (30) biopsy samples, so they can
15 have ten (10).

16 As you suggest, not enough material. So
17 ten (10), that would only be looked -- used to look at
18 mercury; ten (10) that would be used to -- for, say,
19 selenium; ten (10) for another heavy metal. And that's
20 the only method I'm aware of to tackle that issue.

21 MS. JULIE DAHL: Okay. Thank you.
22 Julie Dahl, Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Just one (1)
23 more follow-up question then.

24 To use the large-bodied fish for can --
25 contaminants analysis we are aware that if you try to

1 apply some sort of para-analysis the sample size that
2 you would need for a statistical value to detect a
3 change could decimate the population of a -- of a
4 large-bodied fish if they're small.

5 So do you have a suggestion for the --
6 the sample size that we could be -- that the -- that
7 Dominion Diamond could be looking at in order to get a
8 significantly significant value -- sorry, statistically
9 significant value, in order to detect change in
10 contaminants level?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
15 agency. To answer your question, Julie, no, the -- we
16 -- that is the agency has not looked hard enough at
17 what sample size is required through -- through a para-
18 analysis to answer these questions.

19 But we would like to point that
20 currently in the present AEMP for the small lakes, the
21 Company is sampling for large-bodied fish at a
22 frequency of every -- once every six (6) years to avoid
23 those type of impacts, as you're suggesting.

24 And that is because the current AEMP
25 lakes are very small. They're -- one would almost call

1 them ponds, if you're living in Newfoundland. But
2 anyways, they're much smaller, is what I'm getting at,
3 than the Lac du Sauvage and Lac de Gras lakes. And if
4 we're talking only of Lac du Sauvage, one would expect
5 that you'd be able to increase that sample size over
6 and above what's currently collected for the -- the
7 current AEMP.

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MR. TIM BYERS: Sorry, the -- Tim
12 Byers, with the agency. The -- the -- so as a
13 corollary to that, if it's for Lac du Sauvage, if we're
14 able to increase the frequency from every six (6) years
15 down to, I don't know, every two (2) or three (3)
16 years, I don't -- I haven't seen anything in the DAR
17 that would suggest that that would impact the -- the
18 large-bodied fish communities like trout, and burbot,
19 and whitefish. So that -- that's probably something
20 that needs to be assessed as well. Thank you.

21 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
22 and Oceans. I guess we just have to make sure that the
23 sampling of fish is not greater than the mine effects
24 themselves. No more questions.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North

1 Slave Metis Alliance?

2 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
3 Slave Metis Alliance. We have no questions.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Deninu
5 K'ue First Nation?

6 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
7 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. We have no questions.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Diavik
9 Mines?

10 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Gord MacDonald,
11 with Diavik. No questions.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fort
13 Resolution Metis Council?

14 MR. SHAWN MCKAY (BY PHONE): Shawn
15 McKay, Fort Resolution. We have no questions.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Transport
17 Canada?

18 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSUN: Anita
19 Gudmundsun, with Transport Question. We have no
20 questions. Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Dominion
22 Diamond?

23 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
24 Dominion Diamond. I'd like to thank IEMA for their
25 presentation. No questions.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
2 Board staff and counsel?

3 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza
4 with the Review Board. First off, not directly related
5 to water but related to the Project description.

6 Does IEMA think that an independent
7 review panel for geotech engineering is needed, and why
8 if you say, Yes?

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MR. BILL ROSS: Bill Ross, Agency. The
13 technical review panel that we have suggested, or
14 recommended, was for dike construction that was agreed
15 to by Dominion Diamond, and we are thankful for that.

16 The second one that we mentioned en
17 passant was -- was the potential for such a -- such a
18 body in the context of the Jay Road, just because that
19 was getting complicated in the discussion around here.
20 I would say that the Agency has not recommended that,
21 only that, that was one possibility that could be
22 helpful. And -- and that's the Esker crossing
23 specifically.

24 The -- the rationale -- sorry, I -- I
25 think the second part of your question was, "And why?"

1 And the -- the dike construction is something that
2 wants to get done right because you don't want problems
3 to arise there. And so having good expertise is
4 something that Dominion Diamond agreed to, so we're --
5 we're comfortable with sticking with that one for sure.

6 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
7 with the Review Board.

8 The next question is: Would an
9 inability of fish to move through the narrows represent
10 a significant adverse impact in IEMA's opinion?

11 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
12 Agency. If they do in fact -- and I still don't know
13 the answer to this -- if they -- if they do in fact
14 currently move between the two (2) lakes, and then for
15 whatever reason passage at the narrows is obstructed so
16 they can't, then as we may have alluded to earlier in
17 the day the -- our question would be then:

18 Is there enough spawning habitat to --
19 to maintain the current fish species' reproductive
20 abilities within the lake because of the possibility
21 that there are an awful lot more sub-optimal habitats,
22 and not the best spawning beds within Lac du Sauvage,
23 and that perhaps a lot of the trout need to go to Lac
24 du Sauvage to -- to seek those out.

25 So I -- I hope that answers the

1 question.

2 MR. BILL ROSS: Bill Ross, Monitoring
3 Agency. I -- I would add, it depend -- the answer to
4 your question depends crucially on how long the
5 blockage lasts. If it's a ten (10) minute blockage,
6 I'm going to hazard to guess that spawning is not
7 crucial, although my fish experts may tell me
8 otherwise, but I doubt it.

9 If the blockage is much longer, I think
10 then -- you know, so the usual considerations of -- of
11 determinance of significance would apply. And it -- it
12 -- quite frankly the Agency has not taken an actual --
13 made a determination on whether that would be a
14 significant adverse environmental effect, or -- or not.

15 But there are some clear issues. It
16 would certainly be of concern if it were an extended
17 blockage, as my colleague has indicated.

18 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
19 with the Board. IEMA -- one (1) -- one (1) of IEMA's
20 recommendations was that a specific surface and mine
21 water management plan be completed and required for
22 Dominion for the Jay Project.

23 Are there particular items that IEMA
24 believes are needed within this proposed water
25 management plan?

1 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin --
2 Paquin, with the Monitoring Agency. The Monitoring
3 Agency has included as part of its technical report as
4 well as the presentation made here today a number of
5 specific recommendations as to what should be included
6 in -- in the revised plan.

7 If you wish, I could read those into the
8 record now, or I would simply refer the -- the Review
9 Board to the presentation in our technical report.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin, with
14 the -- with the Monitoring Agency. With the delay in
15 response, what I would like to do is I would like to
16 summarize our -- our specific recommendations.

17 So we -- we recommend in our technical
18 report that the plan include the identification of
19 specific surface and mine water management
20 contingencies, including capacities in terms of
21 effluent volumes and mine production as expressed as
22 operating days.

23 The plan should also include the design,
24 construction, and implementation timing for each
25 identified surface and mine water management

1 contingency plan -- or contingency option, detailed
2 monitoring of water quality and quantity to enable the
3 early detection of success or failure, and associated
4 adaptive management trigger thresholds for the
5 implementation of those contingencies.

6 We went on to recommend that the revised
7 plan for the Jay Project be submitted to the Wek'eezhii
8 Land and Water Board for approval within two (2) years
9 of initiating dewatering operations of the Jay Pit.

10 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
11 with the Board. My last question relates to the waste
12 rock storage area seepage. The agency has stated that
13 they think poor quality seepage water reporting to the
14 receiving environment would represent a significant
15 adverse impact in the near field.

16 Confir -- we were just looking for a
17 confirmation that the near field in this situation is
18 the adjacent creek in Lac du Sauvage. And also, that
19 if IEMA believes that exceeding without adequate
20 mitigation measure -- measures such an exceedance is --
21 is likely and why they think so, of water quality
22 objectives, sorry.

23 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: In answer -- in
24 answer to the first part of your question, yes, near
25 field would include the adjacent streams and nearby

1 waters of Lac du Sauvage.

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

MR. KEVIN O'REILLY: Thanks. Kevin
6 O'Reilly, with the Monitoring Agency. Sachi, I'm going
7 to try to put a little bit more meat on the bones to my
8 colleague's response.

9

I think part of the -- the concern for
10 the agency with the performance of the Jay waste rock
11 storage area is that the Company's proposing,
12 basically, co-disposal of potentially acid generating
13 rock with other non-potentially acid generating rock,
14 granite.

15

And, basically, they -- they've told us
16 that you -- they can't really separate those two (2)
17 types of rocks. So they're talking about having them
18 all together in the -- in the one (1) waste rock pile.
19 That's not something that's occurred before at this
20 mine.

21

The other waste rock piles, there are
22 segregated areas within the waste rock pile where the
23 potentially acid-generating rock is separated. And --
24 and the Company has used a strategy of permafrost
25 encapsulation to try to -- or to prevent bad seepage

1 from coming out of the waste rock piles.

2 So with this waste rock pile for Jay,
3 we're talking about a different method waste rock
4 storage and -- and management, something that hasn't
5 been done before at the mine.

6 But we -- I -- earlier, I mentioned that
7 their -- the agency is aware that even the current
8 waste rock piles, there are some issues with some of
9 them not freezing, and that the Wek'eezhii Land and
10 Water Board has initiated a review of the -- the
11 management of those waste rock piles.

12 We're -- we're not quite sure exactly
13 what the strategy is for the Jay waste rock storage
14 area in that the Company originally had -- had talked
15 about permafrost encapsulation not being required.
16 Then they said that it might be required. So there's
17 some uncertainty about whether permafrost encapsulation
18 is the strategy or not for the Jay waste rock storage
19 area, at least in our minds.

20 And if that's not the case, then how do
21 we ensure that the waste rock storage area actually
22 does stay frozen or that there's no seepage coming out
23 without knowing whether there's going to be rigorous
24 thermal monitoring, not at the end, but during the
25 operation of the -- the waste rock storage area?

1 So I guess in our technical report, we
2 did make a number of recommendations around how we
3 thought that the -- the Jay waste rock storage area,
4 given its proximity to Lac -- Lac du Sauvage and the --
5 the creek and a new method of waste rock disposal, the
6 problems with the current waste rock storage area, how
7 do you design a system and -- and -- that uses adaptive
8 management and has early triggers so if you see
9 something that's going wrong, you don't have to wait
10 until you get acidic seepage because by then it's too
11 late to probably try to really do very much.

12 I -- I'm not sure I've answered the
13 question, but I just tried to paint that bigger picture
14 for you. Thank you. And that -- that's the basis for
15 our -- our concerns. Thanks.

16 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Thank you. Neil
17 Hutchinson, with the Board. I have just one (1)
18 question. It's relating to slide 16 and your concerns
19 about dust deposition on spawning shoals for lake white
20 fish and lake trout.

21 You raised a concern. Do you think that
22 the dust deposition that you've talked about would
23 represent a significant adverse effect on these fish?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
2 agency. Thank you for the question, Neil. I -- I'd
3 just like to clarify. Do you mean significant adverse
4 impact on the Lac du Sauvage fish habitat or on Lac du
5 Sauvage fish populations?

6 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Good question,
7 Tim. Neil Hutchinson, for the Board. If in fact the
8 dust deposition occurred and had impacts on -- on the -
9 - the fish using those shoals, would that be
10 significant? And then secondly, would that be
11 significant in the context of those fish populations
12 for Lac du Sauvage?

13 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
14 agency. I guess I would submit that -- again, there's
15 a -- a number of different variables that comes into
16 play to answer that.

17 But again, it seems to me if Lac du
18 Sauvage, either presently or in the future, becomes an
19 isolated lake -- that is, a lake isolated for fish from
20 Lac du Sauvage -- then the question becomes: How much
21 optimal habitat is there for spawning, specifically for
22 species of fish that would use any spawning beds that
23 could be impacted by -- by dust deposition?

24 And if again, there is a limited number
25 of spawning shoals, then one would assume that in -- in

1 a lake that's isolated from the larger Lac du Sauvage
2 watershed that that potentially could affect
3 recruitment of trout and whitefish that would use those
4 spawning beds.

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson,
9 for the Board. I -- I guess my -- my confusion comes
10 when you've asked the Developer to submit a report to
11 the Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board.

12 And, of course, they regulate a project
13 after people have determined whether or not it has
14 significant adverse effects. So I'm not quite sure
15 what use the model would be to the Wek'eezhii Land and
16 Water Board.

17 Maybe you could explain why you think
18 that that modelling should be done for their benefit,
19 and not for the benefit of this Board that has to
20 determine if the effects are significant or not.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank. Sorry, Tim
25 Byers, with the agency. Thank you, Neil, for that --

1 that question. I guess the -- the long and the short
2 of it is the agency at this point does not come down
3 one (1) way or the other as to whether this potential
4 impact would definitely be a significant adverse impact
5 or not.

6

7

(BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. TIM BYERS: The literature
10 information that we have at our disposal, as the slide
11 has said, shows that there does seem to be a potential
12 for dust sedimentation over at least Lake Whitefish
13 spawning beds, as being a potential problem for egg
14 survival within spawning beds of at least Lake
15 Whitefish.

16 And we do not, at this point, know with
17 the information that we have at our disposal whether --
18 whether the Company's reasoning of why this would not
19 be an impact on fish eggs and alevins would be -- why
20 this impact would not occur because of wave action and
21 current sweeping. So at this point, I can say that it
22 seems that that information would be very useful for us
23 to at least come to that kind of conclusion.

24 MR. BILL ROSS: Bill Ross. Look, this
25 is -- this is an issue that warrants a little bit more

1 study, and that would allow one to progress sat -- I
2 think satisfactorily. There's some loose ends here,
3 and we just thought it would be helpful to suggest they
4 be cleaned up. Thank you.

5 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson.
6 Thank you. That's all.

7 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Mark Cliffe-
8 Phillips, with the Review Board, no further questions
9 from staff or counsel.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from Review
11 Board members?

12 Okay. Thank you. I'd like to call a
13 five (5) minute break. And if we could have the GNWT
14 get their team ready at the front here for the next
15 presentation. Thank you.

16

17 --- Upon recessing at 3:13 p.m.

18 --- Upon resuming at 3:32 p.m.

19

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: As you can see by the
21 agenda we still have a lot to do this afternoon so our
22 legal counsel has met with some individuals and our
23 legal counsel would like to make a -- a statement in
24 regards to the presentations.

25 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Thank you, Madam

1 Chair. It's John Donihee, for the Board.

2 I spoke to Mr. MacDonald at the break
3 and Diavik is fairly far down on the list of
4 presenters. Mr. MacDonald advised that he has an
5 airplane to catch at 5:30 and has been unable to make -
6 - make a flight change. And so the issue becomes
7 really whether any of the parties have questions for --
8 for Diavik in relation to their written presentation,
9 written materials, that are on the record.

10 The suggestion that I -- I make, Madam
11 Chair, is that we relieve Diavik, I guess of the
12 requirement to stay to answer questions, and instead
13 give any parties that might have a question for them
14 the opportunity to ask IRs, ask those questions in
15 written form to Diavik after the -- after this hearing
16 is over this week. And answers to that would come in
17 at the same time as the undertakings so that they'd be
18 on the record in time for people to deal with them in
19 argument.

20 And so my suggestion, Madam Chair,
21 subject to your approval, is that we move forward with
22 that approach unless there's a real objection from any
23 of the parties who are here.

24 So just to be clear then, if somebody
25 does have an objection would you speak to it, please?

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Madam Chair, hearing
4 none, I suggest that we proceed that way. So Diavik
5 will not make a presentation this afternoon and Board
6 staff will correspond with the parties tonight or
7 tomorrow setting out the arrangements.

8 But to put them in broad terms, there'll
9 be questions allowed -- written questions allowed
10 specifically on the presentation and technical report
11 filed by Diavik with timelines as indicated, questions
12 and answers to be received by Oct -- the October dates
13 for interven -- or pardon me, for undertakings.

14 And, Madam Chair, with that I -- I
15 suggest the Board can proceed with the Government of
16 Northwest Territories presentation.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you.
18 The Government of Northwest Territories, your
19 presentation, please.

20

21 PRESENTATION BY GNWT:

22 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Good afternoon,
23 Madam Chair. My name is Robert Jenkins. I'm the
24 director of water resources with the Government of
25 Northwest Territories, Department of Environment and

1 Natural Resources. Sitting with me on the panel today,
2 to my immediate left I have Mr. Nathen Richea; he's the
3 manager of the water regulatory section in the water
4 resources division. To my far left, I have Dr. Barry
5 Zajdlik of Zajdlik and Associates. To my far right, I
6 have Mr. Neil Van Der Gugten of AMEC Foster Wheeler.
7 To my immediate right, I have Dr. Jamie Vangulck with
8 Arktis Solutions.

9 There are also a number of GNWT staff in
10 the crowd today including legal counsel and inspections
11 -- inspection staff.

12 We're here today to present the water
13 related components of the Government of the Northwest
14 Territories's Department of Environment and Natural
15 Resources technical report, and our recommendations
16 associated with Environmental Assessment 1314-01 for
17 Dominion Diamonds Ekati Corporation Jay Project.

18 Madam Chair, first a brief presentation
19 overview. The presentation focusses on the following
20 topics: the influence of the assessment boundaries on
21 the water quality impact assessment; predicted water
22 quality in the Misery Pit, resulting effluent quality;
23 and potential strategies for improving Misery Pit water
24 quality; and finally, impact of disposing processed
25 kimberlite into the mined out Panda and Koala Pits on

1 post closure water quality at the main Ekati site.

2 Throughout the process, and as
3 summarized in our intervention, GNWT has identified
4 concerns with the assessment boundaries that have been
5 used to assess the significance of impacts from the
6 Project.

7 The DAR uses a large regional boundary
8 to determine significance. In other words, local
9 boundary extends from Lac du Sauvage to the outlet of
10 Lac de Gras. While the GNWT acknowledges that a larger
11 regional boundary is required for evaluating cumulative
12 impacts from a project, a more localized assessment
13 boundary is more appropriate for assessing direct
14 impacts.

15 Our concern with the approach taken by
16 Dominion is that use of the regional scale boundary may
17 mask impacts in a localized area, which in this case is
18 Lac du Sauvage. The next few slides will provide some
19 examples that -- that illustrate this concern.

20 The first example is associated with
21 fish abundance. As discussed in our -- in our
22 technical report, any reduction in the fish population
23 in Lac du Sauvage would be reflected as a much smaller
24 reduction in fish population over the larger study
25 area. For example, a 50 percent reduction in Lac du

1 Sauvage would correspond to only a 5 percent reduction
2 in the study area. GNWT believes that this is a large
3 difference, thus considering the significance of
4 impacts in the Lac du Sauvage/Lac de Gras study area
5 could significantly underestimate the magnitude of the
6 local impact in Lac du Sauvage.

7 With water quality, the total dissolved
8 solids, or TDS, concentrations at the end of the
9 discharge pipe could reach as high as 2,925 milligrams
10 per litre. TDS is composed of a number of different
11 site-specific constituents, and the TDS in the effluent
12 from the Jay pipe is estimated to be 60 percent
13 chloride, which corresponds to an effluent
14 concentration of 1,712 milligrams per litre.

15 GNWT is concerned that these
16 concentrations could be toxic to the aquatic ecosystem
17 in the area immediately surrounding the discharge pipe.

18 The second water quality example is
19 increased turbidity in the immediate vicinity of the
20 dike construction zones. Localized zones with high
21 turbidity could be created during the construction of
22 the dikes and the dewatering of a portion of Lac du
23 Sauvage. And there is the potential for impacts to
24 water quality, and fish and fish habitat, as a result.
25 The GNWT is concerned that Dominion has not adequately

1 described or characterized the impact of turbidity on
2 localized zones within Lac du Sauvage during winter
3 construction periods.

4 We also note that there has been a
5 limited evaluation of the potential impacts resulting
6 from the Jay related activities at the main Ekati site
7 on the local assessment boundaries. Processed
8 kimberlite from Jay Pit ore will be deposited into the
9 Panda and Koala Pits. This processed kimberlite may
10 have an impact on post closure water quality in Panda
11 and Koala Pits, as well as the LLCF discharge at Leslie
12 Lake.

13 The current closure plan is to reconnect
14 Panda and Koala Pits -- Pit lakes with Kodiak Lake at
15 the end of operations. However, there is limited
16 information provided on the significance of impacts to
17 Kodiak Lake post closure.

18 And to be clear, Madam Chair, the GNWT -
19 - GNWT is not looking to redefine the assessment
20 boundaries at this point in the process. However, we
21 maintain that it is important to recognize that there's
22 a potential for local impacts, in other words, within
23 Lac du Sauvage or -- or within receiving lakes at the
24 Ekati main site, as a result of the construction,
25 operation, and closure activities associated with --

1 with the Jay Project.

2 Our recommendation to the Board on this
3 issue is intended to draw attention to this issue and
4 to ensure that these localized impacts are not
5 overlooked in the licensing process.

6 So with that, the GNWT recommends that
7 the Review Board include a measure that minimize --
8 minimizes impacts at localized scales, from dike
9 construction, dewatering, operation, and closure of the
10 Jay Pit -- Jay Project site, and its associated project
11 activities at the Ekati mine site, and this is to the
12 extent practical. These include -- these local
13 boundaries should include the initial mixing zone, Lac
14 du Sauvage, Leslie Lake, and Kodiak Lake.

15 Madam Chair, our second topic relates to
16 the predicted quality of water in the Misery Pit. This
17 concern is relevant during operations when Misery Pit
18 water will be discharged as effluent to Lac du Sauvage
19 and during post-closure, when Misery Pit will exist as
20 a pit lake with a connection to Lac de Gras.

21 As described in the DAR, water from the
22 Jay Pit will be managed during operations by pumping
23 into the Misery Pit. However, the Misery Pit has a
24 finite storage volume and after year 5 Misery Pit will
25 nearly be filled. Thus, water in the Misery Pit will

1 need to be discharged to Lac du Sauvage in order to
2 continue using the Misery Pit to manage and store Jay
3 Pit inflows.

4 Initially, the water pumped from -- from
5 the Jay Pit will be of reasonably good water quality.
6 However, as the depth of the pit increases, the water
7 will become increasingly saline, and the overall water
8 quality in the Misery Pit will decrease as the
9 proportion of saline water increases.

10 The GNWT's concern is that there could
11 come a point during operations, as presented in the
12 DAR, when the Misery Pit water would not be suitable
13 for discharge to Lac du Sauvage due to toxicity. This
14 would likely only occur during the last year of
15 operations.

16 However, Dominion has limited
17 flexibility in their water management strategy for the
18 -- for the Jay Project. And at this time, it's not
19 apparent that -- that viable water storage
20 contingencies have been presented for managing inflows
21 if the effluent is potentially toxic to aquatic life.

22 Further, at the end of operations,
23 Dominion has proposed to manage water quality in the
24 Misery Pit by placing a 60-metre freshwater cap to
25 cover the poor quality water that's remaining in the

1 pit. However, over time, the quality of the cap water
2 will begin to degrade and concentrations of TDS are
3 expected to reach approximately 748 milligrams per
4 litre TDS after two hundred (200) years.

5 We do not believe that this water
6 quality, 748 milligrams per litre TDS -- consistent
7 with the naturally occurring conditions in the local
8 ecosystem and will not align with the current closure
9 objectives for the Ekati site. And further, that this
10 water will ultimately report to Lac de Gras post-
11 closure, which would not receive such high
12 concentrations of contaminants during mining
13 operations.

14 However, in an attempt to improve
15 conditions during operations and closure we've
16 suggested a modification to Dominion's water management
17 strategy that could improve the quality of effluent
18 discharge from Misery Pit during operations, as well as
19 the long-term quality in the pit, Misery Pit, post-
20 closure.

21 What we would like evaluated is -- is to
22 begin an evaluation of beginning discharging water from
23 the Misery Pit prior to year 5 of operations, and to
24 increase the depth of the freshwater cap for the Misery
25 Pit.

1 Information in the DAR suggests that
2 water quality in the Misery Pit will be better during
3 the early years of the operation before a significant
4 volume of saline water is pumped from the advancing Jay
5 Pit.

6 We suggest that by discharging water
7 from Misery Pit earlier in operations, perhaps Dominion
8 could increase the storage volume available to accept
9 high salinity water later in the mine life, thereby
10 reducing the amount of poorer quality water that will
11 need to be discharged later in the mine life and
12 improve the over -- overall quality of effluent that's
13 discharged to Lac du Sauvage over the life of the mine.

14 This would add a degree of flexibility
15 into the existing water management strategy at the end
16 of operations.

17 Storing more high-salinity water would
18 also have the effect of increasing the concentration of
19 TDS in waters remaining in the pit post-closure, which
20 would increase the concentration difference between the
21 pit water and the fresh water cap, which should in turn
22 improve the likelihood and stability of meromixis in
23 the Misery Pit.

24 Once operations cease, some of the water
25 in the Misery Pit will be pumped over to the Jay Pit to

1 make room for the proposed 60-metre Misery fresh water
2 cap.

3 The GNWT notes that a deeper fresh water
4 cap would improve the water quality in the Misery pit
5 during post-closure. And this would improve the
6 likelihood that the current closure objectives for the
7 Ekati site could be maintained. So we have a
8 recommendation as follows.

9 Recommend that, in order to prevent the
10 potential for significant environmental impact to VCs,
11 so, water quality and fish and fish habitat -- in Lac
12 du Sauvage and Lac de Gras during operations and post-
13 closure, we feel that a measure should be included
14 requiring that effluent discharge from Misery Pit be
15 managed such that sufficient storage volume is
16 available in later years to curtail effluent discharge
17 volumes in years 9 and 10.

18 So what we're asking for here is an
19 evaluation of discharging effluent in year 3.

20 The above evaluation of -- of management
21 actions should focus on accumulating the worst quality
22 mine water within the Misery Pit to reduce toxicity
23 concerns and impacts to Lac du Sauvage and promote more
24 stable meromictic conditions post-closure.

25 So, Madam Chair, I'd like to make --

1 make sure we're -- that we're coming across very clear
2 on this recommendation. So we heard earlier from the
3 Proponent that they've not precluded discharge earlier
4 than year 5. But they don't believe it's appropriate
5 to make a decision on this aspect right -- right now.

6 The measure that we're requesting is
7 that an evaluation be required moving forward. And
8 ultimately, this information will inform operational
9 decisions that are made during the regulatory process.
10 So I just wanted to -- to provide a little bit more
11 clarification on this recommendation.

12 Our next recommendation is that the
13 Board include a measure requiring that additional
14 volumes of mine water from Misery Pit be pumped to Jay
15 Pit at closure, and an increase to the proposed water
16 cap over Misery Pit Lake to a depth greater than 60
17 metres.

18 Doing so would result in better water
19 quality in the near surface waters of the Misery Pit --
20 Pit Lake than predicted in the environmental
21 assessment, and result in better water quality post-
22 closure -- in other words, a goal for -- for long-term
23 mixolimnion concentrations of less than or equal to 500
24 milligrams per litre TDS.

25 Madam Chair, we'll now move on to our --

1 our final topic that'll speak to you today which is
2 water quality at the main Ekati site that could result
3 from mining the Jay Pit.

4 Processed kimberlite from the Jay Pit
5 will be deposited into the mine, to Panda and Koala
6 pits. At the end of mining, a 30-metre fresh water cap
7 will be placed on these two (2) pits, and they will be
8 reconnected to the Koala watershed. Dominion has
9 indicated that mero -- meromixis is not anticipated to
10 form within this surface water cap.

11 GNWT remains concerns with uncertainty
12 around potential interactions between the processed
13 kimberlite slurry and the overlying fresh water cap.
14 The slurry will be compri -- comprised of both
15 kimberlite solids and processed water, and with time
16 the solids will settle and the separated process water
17 will mix with the overlying water cap.

18 During winter, ice formation will expel
19 contaminants which will al -- also mix with the water
20 cap.

21 GNWT is concerned that these processes
22 could cause the water quality in the Panda and Koala
23 Pits to be poorer than expected, and also that Dominion
24 has not provided as a contingency alternative methods
25 managing processed kimberlite and slurry water within

1 the Panda and Koala Pits.

2 During closure, the Panda and Koala Pits
3 will be reconnected to Kodiak Lake, and it's not clear
4 whether the proposed water cover of 30 metres will
5 provide an appropriate buffer to ensure that surface
6 water quality will be acceptable and stable at closure,
7 and into the post-closure period.

8 Our technical report summarized the
9 objectives and criteria for the closure of the pit
10 lakes that are included in the current closure plan for
11 the Ekati site. And we would note that the current
12 closure plan does not consider the deposition or
13 storage processed kimberlite in the Panda or Koala
14 Pits, and limited details are available on potential
15 impacts of this practice on the environment.

16 As such, the GNWT is uncertain Dominion
17 will be able to meet the current closure objectives if
18 processed kimberlite is deposited into the Panda and
19 Koala Pits. We recommend that additional work be
20 required to optimize the plans to store PK, and slurry
21 water, in Panda and Koala Pits in order to enhance
22 Dominion's ability to meet existing closure objectives
23 for the Panda and Koala Pit lakes.

24 So our last recommendation is that in
25 order to prevent the water quality within the water cap

1 in Panda and Koala Pits from degrading over time, and
2 potentially affect traditional use or valued
3 components, that the Board include a measure requiring
4 Dominion to conduct an optimization study regarding the
5 storage of PK and slurry water in Panda and Koala Pits
6 during the operational stage.

7 Outcomes of this study should be
8 implemented to enhance Dominion's ability to meet
9 existing closure objectives for the Panda and Koala Pit
10 lakes, and we're pleased that -- that Dominion has made
11 a commitment to undertake this work during future
12 regulatory processes.

13 I thank you, Madam Chair, and that
14 concludes our presentation to -- today.

15

16 QUESTION PERIOD:

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Questions
18 from the -- questions from the Monitoring Agency?

19 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
20 Monitoring Agency. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just three
21 (3) quest -- sorry, three (3) questions from me and one
22 (1) from my colleague. And none of my three (3)
23 questions relate to what you've presented here. They
24 relate to other aspects of the Jay Project.

25 In the event of TSS approaching a

1 threshold during dike construction, Dominion's only
2 commitment seems to be a review of the local conditions
3 and -- and activities will be conducted. Now, that
4 leaves us with a question as to what -- as to what is
5 the proposed mitigation in the event that TSS plume
6 somehow escapes containment during construction as has
7 been recently seen in the Diavik construction of 821.

8 So my question is: Does the Government
9 of the Northwest -- Government of the Northwest
10 Territories expect to see an action level for TSS
11 during dike construction established in the adaptive
12 management framework? Thank you.

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. TIM BYERS: And, sorry, Tim Byers,
17 here. For the Board's benefit, TSS is total suspended
18 solids.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you. Madam
23 Chair, it's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT. I think,
24 you know, this is a question that -- that definitely
25 will be addressed, you know, moving forward in the

1 regulatory phase of the Project. There will be an
2 adaptive management plan. It will cover, I'm sure,
3 aspects of construction and operation.

4 And there will need to be triggers
5 placed, and -- and obviously, you know, construction of
6 dikes and things that -- that you may do that could
7 potentially result in an increase to TSS. It's likely
8 a parameter that you may want to look at and develop
9 some thresholds and some management actions for.

10 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
11 agency. Further to that, and this might have been -- I
12 apologize. This might have been a better question
13 directed to Dominion, but we just didn't have a whole
14 lot of time for all our questions. So I'll put it to
15 the NWT folks.

16 Since your mine inspector for the Diavik
17 operations already dealt with this at that particular
18 project, I am wondering to prevent TSS from escaping a
19 blown out silt curtain panel, does the NWT believe that
20 it may be feasible to put in a double wall of silt
21 curtains on the lakeward side of -- of the constructed
22 dike to prevent just the -- just the problem of TSS
23 plume escaping into the Lac du Sauvage water body?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
2 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.

3 So again, I think there will be a bit
4 more of a detailed process associated with answering
5 these types of questions in the future. You know, we -
6 - we do understand that there -- there are mitigations
7 that are being proposed during summer construction.
8 We're not aware of -- we understand, actually, that
9 right now we -- that there -- there's no silt curtain
10 proposed during winter construction.

11 But, you know, again this is something
12 that, you know, when we move forward into the
13 operational phase and -- the operational and the -- the
14 licensing and the permitting phase of this project, it
15 is something that we would have to consider strongly,
16 the mitigations that get put in place, the -- the
17 triggers and the thresholds that would trigger action.

18 And obviously if there's past experience
19 at other -- other sites that we could build upon, then
20 that's something that would be -- need to be considered
21 as well.

22 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you for that
23 answer. Tim Byers, with the agency again.

24 My -- my final question before I pass it
25 on to Emery Paquin, within the extreme wind -- extreme

1 wind effects modelling, which we learned about earlier,
2 that the Company has done for determining whether
3 meromixis would be stable, or whether wind would
4 disrupt the meromixis.

5 I'm wondering -- there was a CE-QUAL,
6 that is C-E-dash-Q-U-A-L model used in this -- in this
7 project. And I'm wondering, does this particular model
8 account for seiche that I -- that I had talked about
9 earlier in -- in our questions? Thank you.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
14 Chair. It's -- it's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.
15 We're not aware if that's included in the model or not.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. It's my
17 understanding that question was already asked to Ekati.

18 MR. TIM BYERS: My apologies.

19 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin, with
20 the monitoring agency.

21 In the GNWT's technical submission, and
22 again on -- in slides 9 and 10 of your presentation,
23 you suggest that Dominion Diamond evaluate discharging
24 effluent from Misery pit as early as year 3, instead of
25 beginning in year 5 as has been suggested by -- or put

1 forward by the Company.

2 The rationale you provide includes that
3 water quality is better in Misery Pit during the
4 earlier years. Discharging earlier will increase later
5 year's storage capacities, and this would result in a
6 more stable meromictic condition in the Misery Pit.

7 I'm wondering, has the GNWT pre -- gone
8 on to predict the effect, the revi -- in the revised
9 schedule or earlier discharge from the Misery Pit, what
10 effect this would have on the long-term water quality
11 in the receiving environment of Lac du Sauvage?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
16 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with ENR.

17 I guess a short answer to your question
18 is we've done a qualitative assessment of the modelling
19 predictions made by the Company for discharge of
20 effluent in year 3 and curtailing discharge later in
21 the mine life, which would include part of year 9 and
22 year 10.

23 And it would appear to us that the
24 quality of water discharged to Lac du Sauvage would be
25 improved and the loadings to Lac du Sauvage would be

1 improved, but we haven't quantified any of that
2 assessment, it's a qualitative assessment only.

3 MR. EMERY PAQUIN: Emery Paquin, with
4 the Monitoring -- Monitoring Agency. That -- that
5 qualitative assessment is -- is satisfactory and I
6 thank you for that response.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from
8 Yellowknives Dene First Nation?

9 MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Po -- sorry.
10 Alex Power, Yellowknives Dene First Nation. We have no
11 questions. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Lutsel K'e
13 Dene First Nations?

14 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
15 K'e Dene First Nation. As indicted several times
16 earlier today and in our technical report, Lutsel K'e
17 is concerned about long-term impacts, specifically the
18 risk of meromixis being disturbed, and also seepage
19 from the waste rock pile among them.

20 I know it's pretty early days. But once
21 the mine is closed and Dominion has finished their ten
22 (10) years of post-closure monitoring, does the GNWT
23 have any plans for monitoring beyond that, af -- after
24 all this is said and done? Thank you.

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
4 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.

5 So one (1) of the things with -- you
6 know, when we move through and into the regulatory
7 process and -- and have the many discussions on
8 different aspects of the project, including --
9 including closure, essentially, the proponent, you
10 know, develops a plan. The closure planning process
11 includes designing for closure. There are a number of
12 monitoring requirements to make sure that the
13 objectives are met, that the criteria are met.

14 And those, you know, objectives --
15 closure objectives and -- and closure criteria are
16 basically, you know, included in the plan and approved
17 by the -- the Water Board. But, in essence, you know,
18 the processes that the Board undertake are to ensure
19 that input from all parties, you know, is included in
20 that process.

21 And so hopefully, in the end, all
22 parties are -- are, you know, okay with the criteria
23 and the -- the closure objectives for the site. And
24 the onus is on the proponent, in essence, to make sure
25 that those -- those criteria and those objectives are

1 met. And, you know, we look for walk-away solutions.

2 I can only speak to the monitoring that
3 the GNWT does now. I think that it would be
4 potentially career-limiting if I were to make a
5 guarantee that we were going to monitor ten (10) years
6 from now at every place we monitor currently.

7 But with that said, we do monitor a
8 number of stations and lakes downstream. We monitor a
9 number of locations in the Lockhart and in the Copper
10 Mine basins from both a water quality and a quantity
11 point of view. And there's no indication right now
12 that -- that that monitoring is going to stop any time
13 soon.

14 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
15 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. So the community
16 of Lutsel K'e is particularly sensitive. We've got a
17 contaminated site just south of us in Stark Lake, so
18 it's -- you know, long, long term is a -- is a big
19 worry for us.

20 Does the GNWT share Dominion's
21 confidence that meromixis would be established in the
22 Jay pit and maintained in perpetuity?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are we close to
2 answer, a response?

3 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: We're getting
4 there. If we could have one (1) more minute, please.

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
9 Chair. It's -- it's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.

10 So the recommendation that we put
11 forward to the Board on the cap and on the discharge
12 strategies and different things were -- some of those -
13 - those recommendations are intended to reduce the
14 uncertainties associated with the stability of
15 meromixis.

16 But we have identified some concerns
17 with the modelling, and -- and we -- we will need to
18 have some more discussions moving forward into the
19 regulatory phase.

20 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
21 K'e Dene First Nation.

22 So basically, you know, I'm sure, you
23 know, meromixis is pretty well established, but, no,
24 you're not 100 percent sure?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. PETER UNGER: I guess there should
4 be a question there. Is that correct? Sorry.

5 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thanks. It's
6 Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT. I -- I don't think that
7 I can give you a -- you know, a 100 percent guarantee.

8 Just to reiterate, you know, that we put
9 forward a number of recommendations to be able to, you
10 know, reduce the uncertainties associated with the
11 stability of meromix -- meromixis, and -- but we do
12 feel that there -- there will be a need to have some
13 additional discussion on this issue into the regulatory
14 phase.

15 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. Peter
16 Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. So a similar line
17 of questioning about the waste rock pile. Earlier I
18 asked IEMA, and they mentioned some concerns about the
19 waste rock piles at Ekati currently.

20 Does the GNWT see a risk of seepage from
21 the waste rock pile, especially given impacts from
22 climate change? And I'm talking long term, so not in
23 fifty (50) years but in a hundred years, two hundred
24 (200) years, that kind of thing. Thank you.

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you. Madam
4 Chair, it's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.

5 You know, this is a question that the --
6 the Company right now is -- is -- as it approaches
7 closure will go through different reviews and
8 iterations of its closure plan moving from what was
9 previously conceptual closure plan to now what is an
10 interim closure plan, and moving forward to a final
11 closure plan.

12 And I think the design of some of these
13 structures will need to be reviewed. Right now I think
14 that there's -- there's, you know, the approach to
15 closure but there's no final detailed designs have been
16 provided, and nothing finalized. So I think that, you
17 know, with things like climate change and -- and
18 potential warming, or climatic cycles in the future,
19 that the closure designs will need to be reviewed and
20 finalized, and they will be.

21 And I think that -- you know, we're
22 going to have a lot of discussion about that. And --
23 but again I reiterate that we're looking at sort of
24 walk-away solutions where -- you know, and in a walk-
25 away solution essentially you're planning for closure.

1 You're designing for closure. And you want sort of a
2 walk-away solution which is perpetual in nature.

3 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you very much.
4 Peter Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene Fst Nation. No further
5 questions. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Tlicho
7 Government?

8 MR. HENRY ZOE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
9 Madam Chair, I have a -- I want to make some comments
10 first.

11 All the issues that we've been dealing
12 with for the last few days during this technical
13 session is very important to us, the Tlicho Government,
14 because all the -- the caribou issue, water quality, et
15 cetera, are very important for us. And we're trying
16 our best to -- to participate effectively during these
17 hearings.

18 However, we're -- we have a concern in
19 regards to how -- how these -- these hearings are
20 going, and -- and also how -- how effective we are dur
21 -- during these hearings. The point I'm trying to make
22 is that -- Madam Chair, is that the same question I
23 raised with IEMA -- IEMA earlier today, I'd like to
24 pose that same question to GNWT because it's very
25 important because through these hearings you got to

1 have expertise so that you can participate effectively.

2 And without funding to groups like us,
3 Lutsel K'e, YKDFN, make -- makes it very difficult for
4 us to -- to participate effectively. So that's one of
5 the concerns I have. So I'd like to pose my question
6 to GNWT since they're in charge of funding now under
7 devolution.

8 It's in regards -- the GNWT and Canada -
9 - can GNWT and Canada investigate and publicly report
10 on the establishment of a permanent participant funding
11 program for environmental assessment held under Part 5
12 of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act within
13 one (1) year of the acceptance of the report of the
14 environmental assessment? As -- as I said earlier,
15 Madam Chair, it's -- it's -- the lack of funding is --
16 is really concerning us.

17 And since the GNWT is in charge of that
18 now, we're -- we like to -- to ask -- our question is:
19 What kind of consultation would you consider to be
20 advisable in the establishment of this participant
21 funding program? That'll be my first question. I have
22 a couple more questions after that. Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: I would ask that the
24 GNW -- GNWT take that under advisement, and they can
25 respond directly to the Tlicho government outside this

1 process.

2 MR. HENRY ZOE: Thank you for that
3 question. I have another question for GNWT.

4 Does GNB -- do you feel that you have
5 the information and tools needed to understand how
6 these two (2) different mines, the Jay and Diavik, will
7 contribute collectively to change -- to changes in
8 water quality effects in Lac de Gras? Thank you.

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
13 Chair. It's -- it's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.

14 You know, I think that -- that we do
15 have a number of in-house experts. We do from time to
16 time retain external expertise. We have experts in --
17 in, you know, land issues, water issues. We do have a
18 group, the Cumulative Impact Monitoring Program, that
19 does look at cumulative effects, and does a number of,
20 you know, undertakes a number of monitoring programs to
21 help better understand the -- the sort of additive and
22 cumulative effects of projects.

23 So I -- I think we do have the tools
24 moving forward to be able to -- to be able to review
25 work that's put forward by the Proponent, you know, in

1 this area. Yes.

2 MR. HENRY ZOE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 My second question is it -- you know, it may be very
4 hard to determine that Diavik's clean-up has been
5 effective.

6 Given the concern of Dominion Diamond
7 that there is no -- that there is not sufficient
8 information about water quality at closure, does there
9 need to be any collective closure planning? Thank you.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
14 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.

15 I -- I do think that -- and -- and we've
16 heard today that both Dominion and Diavik have
17 committed to working together on a -- a mutually
18 acceptable monitoring program. I think that that's a
19 very positive sign.

20 And -- and it is a strong indicator
21 that, yes, there does need to be a review by both
22 parties to be able to sort of look at the information
23 and -- and the changes that are occurring in Lac de
24 Gras. And ultimately, to be able to -- to be able to
25 tease out, you know, when these operations get to

1 closure, what the -- you know, have a better under --
2 understanding of what's happening in Lac de Gras from
3 both operations.

4 MR. HENRY ZOE: Thank you. No further
5 questions, Madam Chair.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
7 Environment Canada?

8 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
9 Environment Canada. We have no questions.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fisheries
11 and Oceans Canada?

12 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
13 and Oceans Canada. No questions.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North
15 Slave Metis Alliance?

16 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
17 Slave Metis Alliance. I have -- I have two (2)
18 questions. The first one is:

19 Who holds liability after the closure?
20 So if the water mixes after the closure, who's
21 responsible for remediating the impacts?

22 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
23 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with the GNT (sic).

24 I'm wondering if -- if the NSMA could
25 provide a bit -- bit more on that question. That -- he

1 had mentioned if the water mixes. So is -- if you
2 could maybe just provide a little bit more background
3 to what you're -- you're asking, it would be
4 appreciated. Thank you.

5 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
6 Slave Metis Alliance. Thank you for that. So
7 meromixis, if that water -- stratified water overturns,
8 or if the mine rock piles seeps after the closure.
9 Thank you.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
14 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with GNWT. I think in
15 terms of liabilities there, when you're talking about
16 mer -- meromixis and -- and things that the -- that
17 Dominion will be undertaking, I think until -- you know,
18 until closure objectives and criteria are met and met
19 for a -- for an appropriate amount of time, you know,
20 the liability is -- is -- remains with the Proponent.

21 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
22 Slave Metis Alliance. What if -- what if you determine
23 that the objectives are met, and then afterwards, it --
24 it mixed?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
4 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with the -- with the GNWT.

5 I -- you know, this is a -- a very
6 speculative question. I think there would be some very
7 strict and defined closure criteria and objectives and
8 things that would need to be met for quite some period
9 of time. And there would be -- have to be high
10 confidence that that -- that those objectives are going
11 to be maintained in the future for the liability to --
12 to be, I guess, moved over to the government.

13 You know, that's about all I can offer
14 on that -- on that question.

15 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
16 Slave Metis Alliance. I just wanted to make sure that
17 there's someone who will be responsible at all the --
18 oh, at all time. Is there going to be someone?

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
23 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with the -- with the GNWT.
24 You know, we -- we've -- we have examples of
25 contaminated sites now. And -- and this is -- this is

1 coming as no surprise to anybody in the room. And
2 there's a number of sites that government is
3 undertaking where the liability has fell to government,
4 either the federal government or territorial
5 government.

6 And so, ultimately, there will be
7 someone responsible, should there be issues at a site
8 that need to be addressed.

9 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
10 Slave Metis Alliance. Thank you. That's my questions.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Deninu Kue
12 First Nation?

13 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
14 D'Entremont, for the DKFN. We have no questions.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Diavik
16 Diamond Mines?

17 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Gord MacDonald,
18 with Diavik. In our technical submission, we described
19 how the Jay Project will change water quality in Lac de
20 Gras and -- and how it is likely to impact on Diavik's
21 closure.

22 For the GNWT, how will the -- how will
23 the GNWT separate changes in water quality caused by
24 the Jay Project when considering the relinquishment of
25 Diavik's closure security?

1 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
2 Chair. It's Robert Jenkins, with the GNWT.

3 You know, as I said in the previous
4 answer, the -- the onus is on the Proponent to prove
5 that their specific closure criteria and corresponding
6 closure objectives are met, you know, prior to any
7 securities being returned by government.

8 You know, in the case of Diavik or -- or
9 in the case of Dominion, there will be regulatory
10 processes in the future that will define closure
11 criteria. And in the case of -- of Diavik, potentially
12 could be a refinement of closure objectives that have
13 been set.

14 Essentially, all pertinent information
15 is -- you know, it needs to be brought forward in that
16 process, and it -- and it will be, you know, considered
17 appropriately. And, you know, as we heard earlier, you
18 know, Diavik and Dominion have both committed to
19 working together to undertake a -- a monitoring, and
20 obviously that information will be very useful to sort
21 of tease out if there are, you know, the -- sort of the
22 -- the -- I guess the implications of -- of discharge
23 from -- from Dominion on meeting the closure objectives
24 for -- for Diavik.

25 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Gord MacDonald,

1 with Diavik.

2 Will the GNWT commit to reviewing the
3 DDEC aquatic monitoring to ensure that it's adequate
4 for their purposes when making these security-
5 relinquished decisions?

6 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
7 Chair. I -- I don't feel that there's a need for a --
8 a formal EA commitment, here.

9 I -- as I just described, this is the
10 process that will be undertaken. During the regulatory
11 process, there will be a closure plan. There will be
12 closure criteria. There will be closure objectives,
13 and there will be monitoring that will be required and
14 input from all parties is needed, including the
15 Proponent.

16 Any information that gets put forward
17 will be put forward through the regulatory process to
18 the Boards, and it will be duly considered and it will
19 be -- and decisions will be made appropriately. And so
20 I -- I don't -- I don't feel that there's a need to
21 make a -- in essence, a formal EA commitment to -- to
22 essentially, you know, as this is sort of the process
23 that -- that will occur in the future.

24 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Gord MacDonald,
25 with Diavik. And the reason -- the reason we're asking

1 is to -- this is the only way we could mitigate the
2 effects on Diavik of this potential consequence in the
3 future.

4 And it -- it can't be just up to
5 Dominion. They can -- they can do -- they can do their
6 work, but it also has to be up to the GNWT to do those
7 reviews in advance so that we can have assurances that
8 -- that tho -- that these kinds of consequences won't
9 occur in the future.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
14 Chair. I didn't hear an explicit question in there.

15 I guess I would say, you know, the
16 GNWT's an active participant in all these processes and
17 that -- you know, and -- and this is the way that we've
18 been operating -- and operating for years and -- and
19 will continue to operate.

20 And so I don't see that they're -- I
21 guess I'm -- I'm sort of a bit wondering about the
22 concern that the GNWT and other parties and the Boards
23 will not consider any relevant information when they
24 make decisions in the future, and that there needs to
25 be commitments made to that effect. I guess it -- I'm

1 just -- I'm -- I'm wondering about the -- the cause for
2 concern for that.

3 MR. GORD MACDONALD: Madam Chair, I'll
4 let -- let it go there. Gord MacDonald, with Diavik.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fort
6 Resolution Metis Council?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Transport
11 Canada?

12 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: Anita
13 Gudmundson, with Transport Canada. No questions.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Dominion
15 Diamond?

16 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
17 Dominion Diamond. I'm just wondering if we could go to
18 the slide 4 for a second, please?

19 Robert -- Robert, I'm just wondering
20 where that 50 percent number under fish abundance came
21 from, which -- because it seems radically different
22 from what we've estimated in the DAR, which is 3.6
23 percent reduction in Lac du Sauvage and less than 1
24 percent in -- in Lac de Gras.

25 So is that -- is that number just for

1 illustrative purposes?

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Thank you, Madam
6 Chair. Yes, it is for illustrative purposes.

7

MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Thank you.
8 Richard Bargery, Dominion Diamond. No more questions.

9

THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
10 Board staff or counsel?

11

MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: Sachi De Souza,
12 with the Board. We have a couple of questions -- one
13 (1) question. The GNWT recommended an optimization
14 study for the placement of fine-processed kimberlite
15 into the Panda and Koala pits.

16

And earlier in the day, Dominion
17 described that the optimization goals were this study -
18 - would be to meet the closure objectives that they
19 described earlier in the day.

20

Are those goals in line with what the
21 GNWT envisioned for the optimization study?

22

MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
23 Chair. It's Nathen Richea with ENR.

24

I did hear the response from Dominion.
25 I think I'm supportive of the goals that they have

1 outlined.

2 From our perspective, we just to make
3 sure that the existing closure objectives are also
4 maintained. As we outlined in our intervention and in
5 our presentation today, there are some areas of
6 uncertainty. I think there's an opportunity that we
7 can take -- take full advantage of here to optimize
8 that. So, yeah, I guess that's all I have.

9 MS. SACHI DE SOUZA: The Review Board
10 staff and counsel have no further questions. Thank
11 you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you.
13 Review Board members, questions? Kirby...?

14 MR. KIRBY MARSHALL: Thank you, Madam
15 Chair. May you go to your slide number 6, please, just
16 for clarification. So thank you for your -- for your
17 presentation. And we appreciate it when you -- you
18 know, when we discuss these issues and you bring up
19 these -- these measures that we can consider.

20 So I'm -- I'm reading through this. I'm
21 doing pretty good till I got to "To the extent
22 practical." And then I sort of got a bit lost and
23 started scratching my head.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Did you say your
25 name?

1 MR. KIRBY MARSHALL: Well, by this
2 time, everybody knows that I'm Kirby Marshall, with the
3 Review Board. And I don't have to go to the washroom
4 yet, so I'm doing fine, thank you. And I'm not Alex
5 Powers.

6 Can you just help me out a bit here and
7 maybe flesh out that "To the extent practic" -- "To the
8 extent practical" a bit with respect to some examples,
9 samples, what -- what you meant? Thank you.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you for the
14 question. It's Nathen Richea, with Environment and
15 Natural Resources.

16 Actually, it's a very good question.
17 The intent of writing the measure in the way that it
18 was written is not to be too prescriptive on what the
19 measure actually is limiting, but also to include best
20 management practices.

21 "To the extent practical" is intended to
22 address sort of best management practices for mixing
23 zones, water quality objectives and standards, impacts
24 to VCs such as, like, water quality, drinking water,
25 fish and fish habitat, so.

1 MR. KIRBY MARSHALL: Kirby Marshall,
2 Review Board. Thank you very much for that
3 clarification.

4 Your slide 11, and again, just a bit of
5 a clarification. So, you know, I get that if you have
6 60 metres, sixty-one (61) is better, sixty-five (65) is
7 even better, a little bit better.

8 Does the GNWT have a percentage increase
9 or a number that we can sort of wrap our head around to
10 see what would -- you would be comfortable with? Thank
11 you.

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you. It's
16 Nathen Richea, with ENR.

17 Again, a very good question. What we
18 intended to address in this measure is the current
19 proposed 60-metre cap would result in a long-term water
20 quality of 748 milligrams per litre TDS in the current
21 proposed case from the DAR. We are uncomfortable with
22 that number, and we are -- we are not -- we don't think
23 it's going to meet the closure objectives that are
24 currently in place for Misery Pit.

25 So we think that a -- a deeper water qua

1 -- water cover is required, but we haven't specified
2 how much deeper. That's the point of your question.
3 The idea is that we will work through this to achieve
4 the goal of -- of water quality concentration for TDS
5 that's less than and equal to -- to 500 milligrams per
6 litre. And that depth will have to be determined
7 through ongoing monitor -- monitoring, modelling, and
8 discussions in the regulatory phase.

9 MR. KIRBY MARSHALL: Kirby Marshall,
10 Review Board. Thank you for your clarification. I
11 appreciate that, and your presentation. And, Madam
12 Chair, no further questions.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you for
14 your presentation. At this time, we'd like to call a
15 strict, only five (5) minute break while we decide,
16 because we're running so far behind, and we have public
17 comments from 4:30 to 5:30.

18 So it might turn out to be much like
19 yesterday, where there's a break, and we'll do public
20 comments, and then there might be a break for supper
21 and continue on. But I'll let you know right after the
22 five (5) minute break. Thank you.

23

24 --- Upon recessing at 4:38 p.m.

25 --- Upon resuming at 4:49 p.m.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: We are going to be
2 opening the meeting with the public comment period, so
3 if we could ask the people that are lined up, the first
4 person that's lined up for the public comments, if they
5 could come and sit at the table?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 PUBLIC COMMENTARY:

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: We would like to ask
11 our first speaker for the public comments to come up to
12 the table, Noeline Villebrun.

13 For some of the speakers that are come -
14 - are going to be coming up, I would just like to
15 remind them that members of the public are welcome to
16 speak their views directly to the Review Board, but may
17 not ask questions of Dominion or parties.

18 Members of the public may also submit
19 their comments in writing to the Review Board until the
20 public record is closed. And speakers will be limited
21 to ten (10) minutes for their presentation. Thank you.
22 Sorry. Ms. Villebrun...?

23 MS. NOELINE VILLEBRUN: Noeline
24 Villebrun, Tthestonotine Dene. I'm going to say a few
25 words in my language.

1 (INTERPRETED FROM FIRST NATIONS LANGUAGE INTO ENGLISH)

2

3 MS. NOELINE VILLEBRUN: Thank you for
4 sitting there for us. You have a very big job. When
5 you sit there for us, so I'd like to say thank you very
6 much to you.

7 The issue of the water that you're
8 discussing here, we, the people, Dene people, we -- we
9 survive by the water. In the past and now, in the
10 future, we've been -- we were -- we are going to be the
11 ones that will be -- that are going to be living off
12 that water. If it wasn't for water, we wouldn't exist.
13 That, I know it.

14 Everyone that is -- even them, if they
15 don't have water even themselves, they wouldn't
16 survive. We -- we value the water very much. The
17 Great Slave Lake here, my son goes fishing on the lake.
18 If it wasn't for him, I would never have fish. He goes
19 hunting for me, also. That's why I'm glad I have a son
20 for a man. He tries to practice his Dene culture way.
21 That's the way we raised him.

22

23 (INTERPRETATION CONCLUDED)

24

25 MS. NOELINE VILLEBRUN: So I will now

1 switch to English. And what I want to capture is that
2 water is a right of the Dene under our tribal
3 sovereign, that in that sovereignty that we have today,
4 and the English language uses that word 'sovereignty',
5 'tribal', to identify the people of the land, that if
6 you're tribal, you have sovereignty on your land.

7 And I learned as recent as last week
8 from a Dene Elder. She said she has a letter from
9 Queen Victoria who wrote a letter to the Dene people
10 saying that, if the settlers came, that there would be
11 no imposition of laws, that the laws would be there for
12 the settlers, that there would be no imposition of
13 taxes on our people.

14 But I -- what I find and what I've been
15 experiencing myself, and I can only speak from my
16 experience, when you talk about the impacts and how
17 industry and government sit here and talk about laws
18 and rules and legislation, and the one (1) thing that I
19 do understand is that Dene law, how we live, supercedes
20 domestic law. Dene law supercedes international law,
21 because international law is made up of laws from the
22 first seven (7) tribes of the world.

23 And when I was told by advisors that I
24 sought -- whether it's on treaty -- international
25 treaty rights or international law, they said to me,

1 Noeline, the Dene don't know where they fit in the
2 world. We know where they fit in. We know where the
3 Dene fit in the world.

4 But over time, through the assimilation,
5 the colonization of our people into communities off the
6 land for development, this is what we faced for many,
7 many years here in the Northwest Territories, right
8 from 1939, as I mentioned before, the four (4) pieces
9 of legislation.

10 But I do recognize and I do understand,
11 and I do take people's words. When I read and I hear
12 judges say that there is cultural genocide committed in
13 Canada, I believe them. I believe her, because there
14 is cultural genocide committed in the Northwest
15 Territories.

16 We're no different than the southern
17 provinces. The only difference is -- is our population
18 and the -- the mass, the huge territory that we have,
19 and as Dene people we have a responsibility for. And
20 our responsibility is to protect it for the future
21 generations. All waters is included.

22 And I know the Government of the
23 Northwest Territories is making deals with other
24 provinces for our water. They never asked us our
25 permission.

1 So this is the type of concerns and
2 process that needs to be said and reminded because,
3 number 1, the Government of the Northwest Territories
4 does not have any power and authority over our lands,
5 over the people.

6 And the only way that they have attained
7 it was through these modern agreements that cede,
8 surrender all your Aboriginal rights and title, your
9 Treaty rights in writ to the Government of the
10 Northwest Territories, the federal government, and the
11 -- in writ of the Queen.

12 So because of this, the people have been
13 impacted. They have really no voice, because the
14 process only recognizes one (1) signature, and that's
15 the signature of the Chief, for approvals on documents.

16 In the Dene way, no one man has
17 authority on this earth to change, to give away land,
18 water, animals that the Creator gave the people. The
19 Creator gave us our own languages, and that's why I
20 speak T'satsaot'ine. I'm a Copper Dene in the English
21 language, Yellowknives, the true Yellowknives is Hon
22 Note Ena Dene (phonetic).

23 Our lands were taken over by modern
24 agreements, membership, registration. Our babies are
25 registered to the Government of the Northwest

1 Territories and we're treated as civilians. So it
2 doesn't matter what we say, because at the end of the
3 day, it's the votes that count, that take over our land
4 and permit these permits and licensing.

5 I got phone calls from Elders from back
6 home. They said, What are we going to do, because we
7 cannot accept these modern agreements? But I notice
8 here in this booklet, you know, there's -- there's
9 unsettled claims.

10 And I'm in an unsettled claim. I never
11 gave up or ceded or surrendered my children to the
12 government or my future generations to the government.
13 It was done.

14 So my recommendation to the Elders is
15 that we use their own process, meaning that if we don't
16 get satisfaction and they continue to go on with the
17 lies that is being implemented, submitted, then we will
18 have no recourse, and the end result will be for the
19 Dene people to start filing liens against the
20 companies, because I already did.

21 I filed a \$63 trillion lien, so I don't
22 know when this Government of the Northwest Territories
23 is going to pay up, because you guys are evicting us
24 from our lands for the development. All your leaders,
25 past leaders -- Rick, you guys are all aware.

1 So when you talk about the protection of
2 the social, cultural, and economic well-being of
3 residents and communities in the Mackenzie Valley, and
4 the importance of conservation to the well-being and
5 the way of life, and the -- you use Aboriginal --
6 that's a -- that's the word here. Aboriginal people.
7 I'm not an Aboriginal person on my own land. I'm a
8 Dene tribal woman, okay? Let's get that right now.

9 So under this, there's cultural genocide
10 that's not being discussed. Cultural genocide also
11 includes the water. It also includes the animals, the
12 land that we have barriers to. How? The Government of
13 the Northwest Territories charges us under the Wildlife
14 Act if we go hunting for caribou. They charge us.
15 They evict us from our homes, because they've got to
16 make way for public interests. And the public
17 interests are the workers that are coming here. So
18 they need to keep that in mind, too, and need to be
19 informed exactly how impacted we are as Dene people and
20 Dene woman and children.

21 So that is my recommendation, that we
22 start filing liens against the government, because I
23 feel that all the contracts that are being divvied out
24 on our behalf has been broken, and our people are
25 impacted severely by the services that these contracts

1 are being divvied out. Yeah. Because it all boils
2 down to the contract, outsourcing of -- of contracts on
3 our behalf. Government, you're doing that.

4 So with that, I will say thank you very
5 much. And I know I'm always the one to come and, you
6 know, be the barrier (sic) of this type of information
7 and -- and -- but it is my truth. And you cannot take
8 it away from me. Nobody in this room can take that
9 away from me. Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Noeline.
11 Our next speaker on the public comment docket, I
12 believe it might be Tracy (phonetic), and I'm sorry, I
13 can't read the last name.

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Tracy isn't here
18 right now. If we could move on to the next speaker?
19 The next speaker for the public comments is Shin Shiga.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Before you begin,
24 Shin, if I can just ask legal counsel for the
25 explanation as to why you're going to be speaking as

1 the -- on a public comment section.

2 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Yeah. Thank you,
3 Madam Chair. It's John Donihee, Board counsel.

4 NSMA did not have material in their
5 submission that addressed matters that have been the
6 subject of today's session. And so the Board did allow
7 the Fort Resolution Metis Council to file and -- they -
8 - they were going to be allowed to participate as
9 members of the public, because they didn't file a
10 technical report. This is an analogous situation.

11 And so when Mr. Shiga asked to register,
12 he's registered essentially on his own behalf. So I
13 would just say that that's the arrangement that was
14 made, and the Board has granted him the time as a
15 member of the public.

16 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Thank you, Madam Chair
17 and the legal counsel. My name is Shin Shiga, North
18 Slave Metis Alliance.

19 I am -- I am really embarrassed to be
20 here as a member of the public. It was my error in
21 judgment that I did not submit my presentation prior.
22 However, during the questioning, it become apparent
23 that I have a comment I simply must make face-to-face.

24 My point is that the area in and around
25 Lac du Sauvage and Lac de Gras is so important that

1 it's -- that it is unforeseeable for North Slave Metis
2 people to consider permanent destruction of fish
3 habitat in the lake not significant.

4 As I said earlier, Metis and Dene people
5 frequent the area, perhaps annually, to set up fish
6 camp in anticipation of the arrival of migrating
7 caribou herd. People gathered there. It was a place
8 in the vast expanse of the barren ground where people
9 of different cultures came together for the -- for the
10 common purpose, to celebrate the abundance of the --
11 abundance and the healing power of the land and water
12 of their traditional territories.

13 After the Jay Project, instead of seeing
14 the trout and whitefish in the shallows of the water,
15 they will be staring into a hole hundreds of metres of
16 -- hundreds of metres deep and 5 kilometres in
17 circumference that is filled with toxic mine
18 wastewater, in perpetuity.

19 We're simply not ready to call it
20 insignificant, that is not a message Metis people are
21 willing to pass on to the next generations. So here is
22 what I'm asking you, Madam Chair and the Board.

23 I ask you that the Board make the
24 determination that the development and the resulting
25 permanent -- permanent destruction of Lac du Sauvage,

1 the fish habitat in Lac du Sauvage and permanent
2 deposition of toxic mine wastewater in Lac du Sauvage
3 will cause significant adverse -- adverse impacts to
4 the Aboriginal people's traditional use of the land.

5 I ask the Board to recommend that the
6 permanent destruction of the land require perma --
7 permanent program, and that until such time that the
8 Jay pit is restored to the original habitat quality,
9 the DDEC will remain responsible for the monitoring and
10 management of the area restored under the offset plan.
11 Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your
13 presentation.

14 I would like to call up Ron Essery.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is Tracy here yet?

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, we'll just move
23 on to presentations.

24 Could I ask Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation
25 for their presentation, please?

1 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
2 K'e Dene First Nation. Is it all right if I stay here
3 or should I go up there?

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: You could stay there
5 because you're right at the front table there, as well,
6 so that'll be fine.

7 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: It's your decision
9 though. If you feel you need to come, by all means.
10

11 PRESENTATION BY LKDFN:

12 MR. PETER UNGER: Okay, thank you,
13 everyone. My name is Peter Unger, and I'm here on
14 behalf of Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation.

15 And so the first subject I'm going to
16 jump into is -- is meromixis. So basically is the plan
17 -- I don't think my laser pointer reaches that far.
18 Yeah, this is not going to mix with all of this, and
19 this is a huge concern for the community of Lutsel K'e.

20 Yes, the probability is low, we
21 acknowledge that. But the impact is very high were
22 mixing to occur. And if -- they're impacts that can't
23 be undone. And Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation firmly
24 believes that any of these direct impacts would be very
25 significant.

1 Furthermore, indirect impacts would also
2 occur, and we believe that these would also be
3 significant. These would be impacts on traditional
4 livelihoods through loss of fishing opportunities, and
5 impacts on traditional life to wildlife that would be
6 drinking that water, including the caribou, which, as
7 we've gone over in great, great detail yesterday, are
8 very important to the community of Lutsel K'e.

9 LKDFN can't find examples of stratified
10 lakes similar to this. And this morning Dominion has
11 admitted a couple times that this is a unique
12 situation. They have cited some analogous lakes.
13 Here's some of them.

14 This is Gunnar pit. I believe it's in
15 Saskatchewan. This is Faro pit. This is Grum pit.
16 This is Vangoda pit. And then here we have the Jay
17 pit. And to quote Sesame Street, one (1) of these
18 things is not like the other ones.

19 These are all fairly closed off, right.
20 They're not really connected to anything. Whereas this
21 is connected to a fairly large lake that's connected to
22 an even larger lake. And I think it's immediately
23 apparent that that's not -- they're not very good
24 choices as analogous lakes.

25 So like I've said repeatedly, Lutsel K'e

1 Dene First Nation doesn't have plans on going anywhere.
2 We plan on being here in perpetuity and being here
3 forever, whereas the mine won't be. We understand that
4 the probability is low, but as time goes on the
5 probability increases, kind of like, you know, the
6 thousand monkeys with the thousand typewriters
7 eventually writing a masterpiece.

8 So our issue is is that if there's any
9 real probability of mixing, if the probability isn't
10 zero or next to zero, then in our opinion it's not an
11 issue of 'if' but 'when'. So our recommendation, which
12 is really long and I'm not going to read out to you,
13 I've got it on three (3) slides here. I just put it in
14 there so everyone has the full text.

15 But basically we'd like to have an
16 independent panel established. We would like this to
17 be thoroughly analyzed by independent experts to really
18 convince us that -- that this is a viable option, that
19 it won't mix, and -- and it'll be established
20 immediately.

21 So moving on to the waste rock storage
22 area, our other major concern that we brought up, I --
23 I have a bullet in there about the mercury issue.
24 We're not going to talk about that. I think that's
25 been covered fairly -- fairly completely. But again,

1 when I'm talking about the long ris -- term risk of
2 seepage here on my slide, we're not talking about the
3 ten (10) years after the mine's closure, we're talking
4 fifty (50) years, a hundred years, centuries.

5 The effects of climate change here in
6 the Northwest Territories have been well documented. I
7 don't think anyone's disputing that, at least I hope
8 not. There will be temperature changes and there is a
9 risk of physical disturbances in the form of
10 earthquakes or storms. So we're -- we're very
11 concerned that seepage will occur when there's no one
12 around to clean it up.

13 As mentioned in IEMA's response to my
14 quest -- question earlier today, there are some
15 concerns involved in the waste rock piles at Ekati
16 right now. So this is a big worry for us that there's
17 going to be a new waste rock storage area established
18 so close to water bodies, especially a large lake like
19 Lac du Sauvage.

20 So our recommendations here is we'd like
21 a revised waste rock storage area management plan that
22 includes long-term adaptive measures. How is this
23 going to be dealt with in the long, long term, so not
24 just for the ten (10) years after mine closure.

25 And then our second recommendation

1 relates to mercury, which again, I think have been --
2 has been dealt with adequately.

3 I'm just going to see if my committee
4 member, Roger, has any comments to make, but that
5 really does conclude my presentation, and thank you for
6 listening.

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. No, that
11 concludes our presentation.

12

13 QUESTION PERIOD:

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Questions
15 from the Monitoring Agency?

16 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
17 agency. No, Madam Chair, we do not have any questions.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from the
19 Government of the Northwest Territories?

20 MR. NATHEN RICHA: Thank you, Madam
21 Chair. It's Nathen Richa, with ENR. We have no
22 questions.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
24 Yellowknives Dene First Nation?

25 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Randy Freeman, with

1 Yellowknives Dene. I have no questions.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Tlicho
3 Government?

4 MS. GRACE MACKENZIE: Grace Mackenzie,
5 Tlicho Government. No questions.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
7 Environment Canada?

8 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
9 Environment Canada. We have no questions.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fisheries
11 and Oceans Canada?

12 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
13 and Oceans. No questions.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North
15 Slave Metis Alliance?

16 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
17 Slave Metis Alliance. We have no questions.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Deninu Kue
19 First Nation?

20 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
21 d'Entremont, for the Deninu Kue First Nation. We have
22 no questions.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: I believe Diavik has
24 left the building and is on a plane.

25 Questions for Fort Resolution Metis

1 Council?

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Transport

6 Canada?

7

MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: Anita

8

Gudmundson, with Transport Canada. No questions, thank

9

you.

10

THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Dominion

11

Diamond?

12

MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,

13

Dominion Diamond. I almost feel like I should ask a

14

question, Peter, but, no, I'm sure the Board staff may

15

have some, so also no questions.

16

THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review

17

Board staff and counsel?

18

MR. ALAN EHRLICH: We have one (1)

19

clarification and one (1) question. The

20

clarification's about something you said at the end.

21

You said -- Alan Ehrlich, for the Review Board.

22

You said mercury has been dealt with

23

adequately. I believe you were saying it has already

24

been raised today so you're not raising the issue. You

25

may have been saying you're fully satisfied with

1 mercury issues.

2 Could you just clarify what your
3 intention was by saying that?

4 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
5 K'e Dene First Nation. Thank you very much for asking
6 me that clarification. I appreciate it.

7 Yes, in no way did I mean that mercury
8 as a contaminant has been dealt with ade -- adequately.
9 I meant that mercury as a subject of discussion in this
10 hearing, I think we've -- has been dealt with -- with
11 adequately. I'm -- I'm satisfied that there's going to
12 be discussion to make sure that the sediments
13 contaminated with mercury are not going to touch the
14 water in any way.

15 But, no, I'm -- Lutsel K'e Dene First
16 Nation is not yet satisfied with any measures that have
17 been proposed. Thank you.

18 MR. ALAN EHRLICH: Okay. And now the
19 more interesting question, I think. The Board is
20 coming up with significance determinations at the end
21 of this process.

22 As you've heard today, societal values
23 are part of what helps the Board understand what's
24 acceptable and what's not. In past environmental
25 assessment, it has helped the Board to understand what

1 are acceptable levels of change from the perspective of
2 the parties in environmental assessments, including
3 Aboriginal parties.

4 So the question that I ask you, and that
5 I hope to ask other Aboriginal groups, although I
6 cannot ask NSMA but perhaps they would put it in their
7 closing statement, is:

8 What, in your opinion, is an acceptable
9 level of change in Lac du Sauvage? This can be a
10 narrative, sort of qualitative statement. What is it?
11 Is it different for operations and closure, too?

12 MR. PETER UNGER: Thank you. So -- I'm
13 Peter Unger, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. So I've --
14 I'm hired by the community and I'm not a community
15 member, so I'm ill-equipped to speak fully for the
16 community. I would love if this question got posed
17 again in Lutsel K'e.

18 However, I have had many concerns raised
19 to me so of course, ideally, absolutely everything
20 would be returned exactly the way it as before, but we
21 recognize that that is not possible.

22 The largest issues raised to me, to echo
23 the NSMA, Lutsel K'e 100 percent also agrees that not
24 all fish habitat is equal, and some of them have much
25 more traditional value than others. So maintenance of

1 fish habitat would be very important. When I have
2 raised it in public meetings, there was a certain
3 amount of shock expressed that the dike would just be
4 left there. That -- that was also an issue that was
5 raised to me in the community.

6 And far and away the issue, I think,
7 that's raised most to me in the community, at least in
8 terms of what we're speaking today, are -- is waste
9 rock storage areas. So I think the community often
10 gets the perception that we're talking about a small
11 pile of rock, but when I show them a photo of what a
12 waste rock storage area actually looks like there are
13 gasps generally.

14 Those are the ones that I think of -- I
15 can think of off hand but, yeah, in terms of Lac du
16 Sauvage I'd have to say, yeah, fish habitat, the dike,
17 and of course water quality. I mean, LKDFN very much
18 values the fact that in most areas of our traditional
19 territory we can just dip our cups right into the lake,
20 and just drink. And -- and that's very, very important
21 to the community.

22 So if we're ever in a situation where we
23 couldn't do that anymore, that would be very
24 significant for the community. Thank you.

25 MR. ALAN EHRLICH: And thank you. Of

1 course, you're able to elaborate your closing argument
2 should you feel the need, but we have no -- we have --
3 we have no further questions from the Review Board
4 staff, Madam Chair.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Review Board members?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you very
10 much for your presentation. We would like the Tlicho
11 Government to present their presentation.

12 MS. GRACE MACKENZIE: This is Grace
13 Mackenzie, Tlicho Government. We don't have a
14 presentation. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Environment
15 Canada, we'd like to invite you to the table for your
16 presentation.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 PRESENTATION BY ENVIRONMENT CANADA:

21 MS. SARAH-LACEY MCMILLAN: Sarah-Lacey
22 McMillan, with Environment Canada. In essence of time,
23 we will skip directly to our slides on aquatics. With
24 me is Anne Wilson and Meagan Tobin.

25 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: All right. Meagan

1 Tobin, with Environment Canada. So in EC's technical
2 report we had identified three (3) issues. Of these,
3 several have been addressed by Dominion in their
4 response to our technical report, as well as in
5 discussions this morning. So for the interest of time,
6 I will only briefly discuss those issues which we
7 considered resolved.

8 The first issue being the phosphorus
9 benchmark concentration. So EC is pleased to say that
10 this issue has been resolved, and Dominion has accepted
11 our recommendations with regards to setting the
12 phosphorus benchmark at 0.01 milligrams per litre. And
13 at maintaining the trophic status of the lake at
14 oligotrophic.

15 Our next issue had to do with the
16 effects study area for the environmental assessment,
17 and the progress that has been made on the Aquatic
18 Effects Monitoring Program.

19 Earlier this morning, Dominion clarified
20 that within the effects study area Lac de Gras and Lac
21 du Sauvage will be evaluated separately. This
22 alleviates Environment Canada's concern with the
23 effects study area boundaries.

24 With regards to the Aquatic Effects
25 Monitoring Program, Environment Canada is still

1 concerned with the lack of detail currently provided in
2 the AEMP as several key components to the study design
3 have not yet been determined. Without a robust AEMP,
4 Environment Canada does not have confidence in the
5 ability to detect effects in the receiving environment.

6 Additionally, since the time frame to
7 collect adequate baseline data is shrinking, it becomes
8 important that these key components are addressed
9 sooner rather than later so that the study design can
10 be implemented, and accurate and sufficient baseline
11 data is collected. This baseline data is crucial to
12 analysis and detection of effects.

13 Dominion has continually stated that the
14 details of the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program will
15 be developed through the regulatory process, and they
16 proposed a workshop to be scheduled at a later date to
17 work through the details.

18 Environment Canada seeks a commitment
19 from Dominion that adequate baseline will be collected
20 prior to any construction activity. EC supports the
21 idea of a collaborative workshop, but suggests that it
22 be held well in advance of construction.

23 Our last concern regards to the post-
24 closure water quality in Misery Pit. According to
25 Dominion's modelling, the post-closure water quality in

1 Misery Pit is expected to exceed several guidelines in
2 perpetuity. This is of concern since upon closure
3 Misery Pit overflow will be discharging to Lac de Gras.

4 Environment Canada had asked Dominion to
5 provide additional contingency options for managing
6 exceedances in Misery Pit at closure and post-closure.
7 The Proponent had indicated that their mitigation
8 strategy is to adjust the thickness of the freshwater
9 cap as necessary to allow for further isolation and
10 dilution of the poor water quality below.

11 EC acknowledges that there is time to
12 solidify the Closure Plan for Misery. This being said,
13 Environment Canada would like to see additional
14 contingency measures and commitments to ensure that
15 upon closure and post-closure water quality of the
16 freshwater cap in the Misery Pit is protective of the
17 aquatic environment.

18 This should include ongoing monitoring,
19 model updates and calibration, adaptive management, and
20 investigation of contingency options as further
21 information on the Misery Pit water is collected.

22 Thank you, Madam Chair. That's all for
23 us.

24

25 QUESTION PERIOD:

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you.

2 Questions from the Monitoring Agency?

3 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
4 Agency. Thank you, Madam Chair. We have two (2) quick
5 questions. I don't know if the answers will be quick
6 but the questions will be. And they both relate to
7 release of effluent into the mixing zone. Firstly,
8 acute toxicity under the Fisheries Act.

9 Does Environment Canada interpret the
10 Fishery -- Fisheries Act as there being no permissible
11 acute toxicity beyond end of pipe? And that's just a
12 simple yes or no, but if you want to elaborate that's
13 fine.

14 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
15 Environment Canada. Yes, that is correct.

16 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you. Tim Byers,
17 with the Agency. And our last questions is again with
18 release of the affluent into the mixing zone.

19 Under the Migratory Birds Convention
20 Act, there shall be no harm done to migratory species
21 of birds. And the Agency is wondering, Should a
22 migratory species land -- bird land in the mixing zone,
23 and if there is toxicity of the effluent within that
24 mixing zone, is it something that can -- that the
25 Convention Act can address for the Jay -- either the

1 Misery Pit or the Jay -- or sorry, the Jay Pit?

2 Because what we're concerned about is if
3 a bird lands -- a water bird lands in the mixing zone,
4 and it proves to be toxic, that ingestion of that
5 effluent either by direct drinking or preening of
6 feathers may cause certain health effects. And so we
7 are wondering if the Migratory Bird Convention Act is
8 something at play for a mixing zone specifically.

9 MS. ANNE WILSON: Thank you, Madam
10 Chair. It's Anne Wilson, with Environment Canada. And
11 thank you, Tim, for an interesting question.

12 We haven't specifically addressed this
13 one in mining operations. It has come up in connection
14 with oil sands, no surprise there.

15 In this case, I would be very surprised
16 if the water released at acceptable quality from end of
17 pipe would provide any toxicity to wildlife in the
18 mixing zone. That said, we can undertake to confirm
19 this with our wildlife health specialists, and provide
20 confirmation of that answer back as soon as possible.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you for that
25 answer. And I follow up -- follow up to that is the

1 same question about the Migratory Bird Convention Act.
2 Does EC -- or Environment Canada see there to be a
3 potential problem for birds landing in the Misery Pit?
4 Sorry, Tim Byers, with the Monitoring Agency.

5 MS. ANNE WILSON: Anne Wilson,
6 Environment Canada. And I would have to give the same
7 answer that, based on what I've seen of the water
8 quality in other similar situations, red flags have not
9 been raised by our wildlife folks in the oil sands
10 files.

11 But again because I don't do wildlife
12 health, I would like to get a confirmation of that, and
13 bring it back. And that should be probably by closing
14 comments, I would hope.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Legal counsel...?

16 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Thank you, Madam
17 Chair. It's John Donihee.

18 I just confirmed that IEMA does want to
19 get that information by way of the undertaking, and if
20 so we'll register it as Undertaking number 15.

21 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
22 Agency. Yes, that's correct. We would like to get
23 that information. Thank you.

24 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Mark Cliffe-
25 Phillips with the Review Board. Just in terms of EC's

1 clarification on what they're undertaking to do, if you
2 could just repeat that for the record, that'd be
3 fantastic.

4 MS. ANNE WILSON: Thank you. Anne
5 Wilson, Environment Canada.

6 What my undertaking is on behalf of EC
7 is to approach our wildlife toxicology expert and ask
8 him, based on the water quality estimates we have for
9 Misery and Jay, whether he anticipated any issues with
10 harm to wildlife because the Migratory Birds Convention
11 Act speaks specifically to harm.

12

13 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 15: Environment Canada will
14 approach their wildlife
15 toxicology expert and ask
16 him, based on the water
17 quality estimates we have
18 for Misery and Jay, whether
19 he anticipated any issues
20 with harm to wildlife
21 because the Migratory Birds
22 Convention Act speaks
23 specifically to harm

24

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: If -- if it has been

1 taken as an undertaking, there is a deadline, like for
2 -- October 9th I believe is the deadline.

3 MR. TIM BYERS: And this is our last
4 corollary question, if I may. Tim Byers, with the
5 Agency.

6 We are wondering, for the purposes of
7 the Migratory Bird Convention Act, and we don't know
8 the answer to this at all, is there -- like there is
9 for the Fisheries Act, is there an acute toxicity
10 aspect to that Act for migratory birds that can be
11 acted upon?

12 MS. ANNE WILSON: Anne Wilson,
13 Environment Canada. No, we do not have the analogous
14 test like we do with water for rainbow trout and other
15 acute indicators of deleteriousness for the bird test.
16 It tends to more than an inspector will find birds that
17 have been killed, and then launch an investigation from
18 that end.

19 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you. That
20 concludes our questions.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Government
22 of the Northwest Territories?

23 DR. BARRY ZAJDLIK: Barry Zajdlik, on
24 behalf of the GNWT. I have a question.

25 Has Environment Canada linked the change

1 from ultraoligotrophic to oligotrophic status with
2 concomitant changes in mercury in edible fish tissues?

3 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
4 Environment Canada. No, we have not drawn that link.

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 DR. BARRY ZAJDLIK: Barry Zajdlik, on
9 behalf of the GNWT. We have no further questions.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
11 Yellowknives Dene Band -- or First Nations, pardon me.

12 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Randy Freeman, with
13 the Yellowknives Dene. I have no questions.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Lutsel K'e
15 First Nation?

16 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
17 K'e Dene First Nation. Has Environment Canada --
18 Canada done any analysis on the models for the
19 establishment of meromixis that the Company has
20 developed?

21 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin, with
22 Environment Canada. We currently do not have available
23 modeling expertise to adequately assess these models.
24 So therefore, no, we did not assess the models.

25 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel

1 K'e Dene First Nation. How about the waste rock pile?

2 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin,
3 Environment Canada. We had reviewed the waste rock
4 pile, and had not identified concerns.

5 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
6 K'e Dene First Nation. No further questions. Thank
7 you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Tlicho
9 Government?

10 MS. GRACE MACKENZIE: Grace Mackenzie,
11 Tlicho Government. No questions.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fisheries
13 and Oceans Canada?

14 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
15 and Oceans. No questions.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North
17 Slave Metis Alliance?

18 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
19 Slave Metis Alliance. I just wanted to follow up
20 Peter's question about meromixis.

21 So you said you didn't have enough
22 expertise -- expertise in EC. If it's part of your
23 mandate, wouldn't you -- why wouldn't you hire external
24 expertise? Thank you.

25 MS. ANNE WILSON: Yeah. Anne Wilson,

1 Environment Canada.

2 There is reliance on what the Company
3 presents, and there have been a lot of questions and
4 IRs going back and forth on that. And that said, we
5 absolutely will be watching the monitoring results over
6 time. This is going to be a subject of ongoing water
7 quality monitoring, hydrology monitoring, pit lake
8 behaviour.

9 And typically we would request that the
10 model be recalibrated with real world data over time to
11 ensure that the predictions made are accurate, and
12 adjust them if they are not. And this will help inform
13 the management response of the Company, as well.

14 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
15 Slave Metis Alliance. Thank you. I just want --
16 wanted to clarify that. So you do have enough
17 expertise to do that monitoring?

18 MS. ANNE WILSON: Anne Wilson,
19 Environment Canada.

20 And just to clarify that EC does not do
21 the monitoring, but we do review the results that are
22 provided by the Company under their regulatory annual
23 reports, and any special studies that they do.

24 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
25 Slave Metis Alliance.

1 So -- so you are not necessarily
2 confident that the model is -- is reliable? Is that --
3 is that accurate?

4 MS. ANNE WILSON: Anne Wilson,
5 Environment Canada.

6 I could not say that. The Company has
7 used credible modellers. They have done a thorough
8 reexamination in the IR process. So without being a
9 modeller myself, which I'm far from, I would not be
10 able to stand -- sit here and state that I have no
11 confidence in the model, or that I have full confidence
12 in the model.

13 All I can say is that we appreciate that
14 the Company has done the best job that is possible on
15 this, but we're going to be watching.

16 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Thank you. That's all
17 my questions. Shin Shiga, North Slave Metis Alliance.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Deninu
19 Kue First Nation...?

20 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
21 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. We have no questions.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Fort Resolution Metis
23 Council...?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Transport Canada...?

2 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSUN: Anita

3 Gudmundsun, with Transport Canada. We have no
4 questions.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Dominion
6 Diamond?

7 MR. RICHARD BARGER: Richard Barger,
8 Dominion Diamond. I'm wondering if -- if I could have
9 that undertaking read back to me again, just so I
10 understand what was taken away by Environment Canada to
11 -- to look at, and -- and the time frames involved?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Mark Cliffe-
16 Phillips, with the Review Board. The undertaking as we
17 have recorded is:

18 "Environment Canada will approach
19 their wildlife tox -- toxicology
20 expert and determine if based on the
21 water quality predictions for Misery
22 Pit and Jay Project mixing zone -- or
23 the mixing zone, they anticipate any
24 harm to migratory birds under the
25 Migratory Bird Convention Act."

1 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
2 Dominion Diamond. Just may -- maybe this isn't a
3 question for Environment Canada, a question for the
4 Board in terms of procedure.

5 I'm not sure -- and -- and I apologize
6 if -- if I'm incorrect in this -- in this instance, but
7 I'm not sure I've heard that before seen in the
8 technical reports, and I don't think we've been asked
9 that question. And this is going to come at -- I
10 understand, at the end of the undertaking period, this
11 -- this evaluation by Environment Canada.

12 How -- what would the process be for
13 Dominion to provide either a response or understand the
14 information so that we ensure that -- that our views
15 and -- and the work that we've done are -- can help
16 inform the Board on this particular issue? Thank you.

17 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Thank you. It's
18 John Donihee, Board -- Board counsel.

19 Normally when the undertaking responses
20 come in, they're -- the transcripts will usually be
21 filed before that. They're usually -- so the
22 undertaking responses are usually the last of the
23 evidence that's filed. And subsequent to that, then we
24 have a written argument period.

25 The other Intervenors, of course, will

1 file written argument first, and Dominion then has the
2 opportunity to reply to those arguments and -- and
3 advance its own arguments if -- if it so wishes. That
4 -- that's the process that's in place at the moment.

5 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Just one moment,
6 Madam Chair.

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Sorry -- Richard
11 Bargery, Dominion Diamond.

12 Sorry, I'm just trying to sort through
13 the process of -- of when evidence and -- and what you
14 can comment, and -- and what period of time. I'm
15 wondering if the easiest way to -- to address this to
16 ensure that -- that we help inform the decision makers
17 on this is that we also provide a response to that
18 undertaking during the undertaking period.

19 As well, is that -- would that be
20 something would help? We want to ensure -- because --
21 because -- forgive me if I'm -- I'm wrong on this.
22 This does seem to be a new issue that -- that wasn't in
23 the -- the technical reports.

24 And -- and so I'm just not quite sure
25 how to -- how to deal with it from -- from a

1 Proponent's perspective. And I just want to -- I want
2 to make sure we do it appro -- an appropriate way and -
3 - and we give the Board the best information that --
4 that we can for them to make their decisions.

5 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: Madam Chair, it's
6 John Donihee, Board counsel. I -- I just -- if I may
7 ask a question?

8 It is a concern from Dominion that the
9 way the -- I described the process, which is what I
10 understand is in place, that you wouldn't have the
11 opportunity to file any evidence. Yeah, okay.

12 In which case, then, Madam Chair, Mr.
13 Cliffe-Phillips has just pointed out the hearing
14 undertakings are due on the 9th of October, and written
15 closing arguments from the parties are not due until
16 the 23rd of October, with the final closing arguments
17 from Dominion on the 30th. So there's room in between
18 the 9th and the 23rd for Dominion to reply.

19 By that, I mean with evidence to
20 anything that comes from the Environment Canada
21 undertaking. So my -- my suggestion, if it will work
22 for Dominion, is that Environment Canada file their
23 undertaking response on the 9th, and that you -- a week
24 later, if you want to file some evidence in reply, you
25 can do so.

1 And then we'll just -- we still have
2 time, then to follow the -- the rest of the argument
3 deadlines out without changing the -- the arrangements.
4 So if -- if that's acceptable, Madam Chair, I suggest
5 that's -- to -- to Dominion, I -- I suggest that we --
6 we proceed that way.

7 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
8 Dominion Diamond. Madam Chair, thank you. I'd like to
9 thank you and your staff.

10 That -- that would be acceptable to us,
11 and it seems like an appropriate -- appropriate way to
12 proceed on this so you have the best -- like I say, you
13 have the best evidence that -- possible to make your
14 decision.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: No further
19 questions.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
21 Board staff and counsel?

22 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Thank you. Neil
23 Hutchinson, for the Board. I'm -- I'm pleased that
24 Environment Canada and -- and Dominion Diamonds have
25 come to agreement on .01 milligrams per litre of

1 phosphorus for your benchmark.

2 Just to assure clarity going into the
3 regulatory phase, I'd just like your opinion on how you
4 would measure that, how you would interpret that. Do
5 you see that as a median value of annual measurements,
6 75th percentile?

7 And secondarily, where would you want
8 that to be measured?

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Environment Canada
13 would like to defer that for discussion, they -- as --
14 if and when we proceed to regulatory. Meagan Tobin,
15 with Environment Canada.

16 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Neil Hutchinson,
17 for the Board. I respect that. It's being presented
18 as a benchmark, though, and we just want a little bit
19 of clarity at the EA stage.

20 Is there -- is there any chance we can
21 get that or just an opinion?

22 MS. ANNE WILSON: Anne Wilson,
23 Environment Canada. And, sorry, Neil. You have caught
24 us a little bit unprepared on this question. We have
25 not thought that far ahead as to the monitoring.

1 My expectation would be that there would
2 not be an area of the lake in the immediate receiving
3 environment that consistently exceeds that as probably
4 somewhere between a median and a 75th percentile.
5 We're going to have to look and see, though, where it
6 goes, what the effects of loading might be in the area
7 of the discharge.

8 So I think we have a little further work
9 to do before we can think that one through.

10 DR. NEIL HUTCHINSON: Thank you. No
11 further questions.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from Review
13 Board?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your
18 presentation. We need to have an emergency two (2)
19 minute break.

20

21 --- Upon recessing at 5:52 p.m.

22 --- Upon resuming at 5:56 p.m.

23

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. We have a
25 presentation from Fisheries and Oceans Canada. You may

1 begin.

2

3 PRESENTATION BY DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND OCEANS

4 CANADA:

5 MS. JULIE DAHL: Thank you. Julie Dahl

6 -- oh, sorry. I'll get into my -- okay. Good after --

7 good afternoon, Madam Chair, Board members, and

8 participants to the hearing process. My name is Julie

9 Dahl, and I am the regional manager for regulatory

10 reviews for the Fisheries Protection Program in

11 Department of Fisheries and Oceans. A very long title.

12 I'd also like to introduce Veronique

13 D'Amours-Gauthier, fisheries protection biologist, also

14 with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and lead

15 assessor on this project. Our presentation will

16 briefly go over our regulatory mandate, and provide a

17 summary of our technical review comments provided in

18 our report to the Board.

19 So on the -- on behalf of the Government

20 of Canada, the mandate of Fisheries and Oceans Canada

21 Fisheries Protection Program is to maintain the

22 sustainability and ongoing productivity of commercial,

23 recreational, and Aboriginal fisheries. Our role is

24 mainly defined by the Fisheries Act, and some key sess

25 -- sections, mostly notably being Subsection 35(1) that

1 states:

2 "No person shall carry on any work,
3 undertaking or activity that results
4 in serious harm to fish that are part
5 of a commercial, recreational or
6 Aboriginal fishery, or to fish that
7 support such a fishery."

8 So in the -- in the Fisheries Act,
9 serious harm to fish is defined as the death of fish,
10 or any -- any permanent alteration or destruction of
11 fish habitat. The Act also gives definitions of
12 commercial, Aboriginal, and recreational fisheries.

13 Also Section 20 which relates to the
14 provision of sufficient water for fish and the
15 requirement for unimpeded fish passage. And I would
16 also like to mention Section 36 and its regulations,
17 which are administered by and enforced by Environment
18 Canada, that prohibit the deposit of a dilatory
19 substance into waters frequented by fish, unless
20 authorized by regulation.

21 So I'll just go through some of the
22 issues that we had identified and sort of conclude
23 where we are at with them. So with respect to
24 blasting, Dominion Diamond cited DFO's guidelines for
25 the use of explosives in or -- in and -- in or near

1 Canadian fisheries waters when they were setting their
2 blasting threshold of 100 kilopascals.

3 For the purposes of mitigating effects
4 of blasting on fish in Lac -- Lac du Sauvage, the use
5 of these guidelines does not constitute approval under
6 the Fisheries Act. And where review dictates, that
7 blasting -- that -- review of blasting plans -- plans
8 dictate, additional mitigation may be required.

9 As a result of testing and monitoring in
10 the North, a threshold limit of 50 kilopascals for
11 instantaneous pressure change was found to be more
12 appropriate to mitigate the effects of blasting on fish
13 than the 100 kilopascal threshold provided in the
14 guidance document that -- of Fisheries and Oceans.

15 Fisheries and Oceans Canada notes that
16 it is important to establish blasting plans for
17 avoiding and mitigating serious harm to fish at shoal
18 S4, which is identified as being of fair quality for
19 cisco and lake trout, and is the closest shoal to the
20 proposed pit, being located 315 metres northeast of the
21 proposed Jay pipe.

22 Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommended
23 that Dominion Diamond revise their instantaneous
24 pressure threshold of 100 kilopascals to 50 kilopascals
25 and recalculate the appropriate set -- setback

1 distances and also recommended that Dominion Diamond
2 develop an appropriate blast monitoring and mitigation
3 plan to ensure that peak particle velocities do not
4 exceed 13 millimetres per second at shoal S4 during the
5 time of lake trout egg incubation, including procedures
6 to be followed in the event that the blast may exceed
7 this threshold.

8 As we heard in Dominion Diamond's
9 presentation, they have agreed to all of these
10 recommendations. With respect to channel diversions,
11 Fisheries and Oceans Canada noted that other fish
12 species besides grayling and lake trout were present in
13 various streams to be impacted by the project.

14 And, therefore, the diversion must
15 incorporate features that consider the fish passages
16 needs of not only arctic grayling and lake trout, but
17 also burbot and northern pike at all relevant life --
18 life stages at both low and high flows.

19 Additional information will be required
20 from Domi -- from Dominion Diamond regarding their
21 plans for reclamation of streams B0 and AC35 (phonetic)
22 during site closure and reclamation, given that current
23 plans indicate the diversion channel is a temporary
24 channel that will be reclaimed at closure when the dike
25 is breached, allowing the natural channels to be

1 reconnected to Lac du Sauvage.

2 Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommended
3 that Dominion Diamond implement best management
4 practices in the design of their diversion and mitigate
5 serious harm to fish as a result of the diversion,
6 including appropriate design of the stream diversion to
7 facilitate fish passage.

8 Fisheries and Oceans Canada also
9 recommended that a -- an appropriate stream diversion
10 maintenance and monitoring plan be in place to ensure
11 that barriers to fish passage do not form over the life
12 of the diversion channel.

13 Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommended
14 that Dominion Diamond provide Fisheries and Oceans with
15 detailed plans of the diversion for review and
16 determination of serious harm, avoidance, and
17 mitigation, including such things as design, flows,
18 stabilization, consideration of fish passage, erosion,
19 and sediment control. These plans may be provided
20 during the regulatory phase, should the project be
21 approved to proceed.

22 Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommended
23 that the detailed closure and reclamation plans for the
24 diversion, including the reclamation of natural
25 channels and drainages to Lac -- Lac du Sauvage, be

1 provided for review during the regulatory phase, should
2 the project be approved to proceed. Dominion Diamond
3 has agreed to all of these recommendations regarding
4 the stream diversions.

5 With respect to water levels, Fisheries
6 and Oceans Canada understands that Dominion Diamond
7 anticipates impacts to water levels of Lake C1 and
8 associated Stream C1 connecting to Lac du Sauvage to be
9 within the range of natural variability.

10 Fisheries and Oceans Canada concurs with
11 the incorporation of water-level monitoring for Lake C1
12 and Stream C1 in the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan to
13 identify necessary measures to avoid and mitigate risk
14 of serious harm to fish in the Sub-ba -- Sub-basin C.

15 We recognize that monitoring of
16 hydrology of Lake C1 and Stream C1 throughout the open
17 water season in the interval of 2016 to 2019 has been
18 presented in the conceptual Aquatic Effects Monitoring
19 Plan.

20 Although the extent to which the narrows
21 is used by fish to migrate between Lac du Sauvage and
22 Lac de Gras has yet to be conclusively determined, as a
23 precautionary approach and based on knowledge -- local
24 knowledge by resource users, this area is considered
25 important for fish and impacts should be minimized or

1 avoided.

2 Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommended
3 that water levels be monitored in C1 and Stream C1 at -
4 - at depth-limiting -- and at depth-limiting locations
5 in the narrows during the open water season,
6 particularly during years of low precipitation,
7 extended drought, or back-flooding at closure of the
8 Jay Pit to ensure that project effects on these water
9 bodies do not negatively impact fish passage or fish
10 habitat. This monitoring should be incorporated into
11 programs such as the Aquatic Effects Monitoring
12 Program.

13 Fisheries and Oceans Canada also
14 recommends that a mitigation response or action plan be
15 developed in consultation with -- with Fisheries and
16 Oceans in the event that significant changes in water
17 levels as a result of the project are likely to occur
18 to mitigate the risk of the formation of barriers to
19 fish passage or serious harm to fish in Lake C1, Stream
20 C1, and in the narrows.

21 With respect to the requirement to
22 remove fish from the diked -- the diked-off areas of
23 Lac du Sauvage prior to dewatering, the Developer's
24 Assessment Report states that some Aboriginal groups
25 are not supportive of the transfer of fish during fish-

1 out because of the mortality rates and injuries to
2 fish.

3 Dominion Diamond has identified that
4 relocation of fish will be considered only for small-
5 bodied fish caught in traps or by electro-fishing.
6 Fisheries and Oceans Canada con -- concurs with
7 Dominion Diamond's stated intention to refine the fish-
8 out plan after further engagement with communities and
9 Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

10 We also note that Dominion Diamond has
11 listed other potential uses for these small-bodied
12 fish, including provision to trappers and dog handlers
13 for bait and food and to make fertilizer for use in
14 commun -- use in community gardens, as well as possible
15 transfer to Lac du Sauvage to provide potential forage
16 for larger fish.

17 Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommends
18 that Dominion Diamond conduct additional consultations
19 with affected communities regarding the handling and
20 fate of fish captured during the fish-out of the diked
21 -- diked area in Lac du Sauvage, either relocation to
22 Lac du Sauvage and/or processing for use by communities
23 and for data collection.

24 The finalization of the fish-out plan
25 may occur during the regulatory phase should the

1 project be approved to proceed.

2 Further to the conceptual offsetting
3 plan, there is a need for suitable avoidance,
4 mitigation, and offsetting measures. Fisheries and
5 Oceans Canada will continue to work with Dominion
6 Diamond on the formulation of suitable avoidance,
7 mitigation, and offsetting plans for the Jay Project to
8 address project impacts to fish and fish habitat.

9 Such plans will incorporate data from
10 additional baseline studies that we understand were
11 being performed by Dominion Diamond on Streams AC35,
12 B0, and B1 from May 18th until September 30th of this
13 year.

14 Additional discussions between Fisheries
15 and Oceans Canada and Dominion Diamond will continue to
16 focus on the quantification of fisheries productivity
17 impact -- impacts as a result of the Jay Project.

18 As recently detailed by Dominion
19 Diamond, approximately 3.6 percent of the total number
20 of fish in Lac du Sauvage will be targeted for removal
21 from the dewatered area, which is expected to result in
22 a minor -- in minor effects to population abundance and
23 distribution for fish.

24 Fisheries and Oceans Canada recommends
25 that Dominion Diamond conduct additional -- sorry,

1 sorry -- conduct additional consultation with affected
2 communities, and con -- continue to work with Fisheries
3 and Oceans Canada regarding the development of
4 appropriate quantification of fisheries productimity --
5 productivity impacts in Lac du Sauvage and Streams AC35
6 and B0, as well as to develop options for offsetting
7 the impacts of the project on fisheries' productivity
8 that cannot be avoided or mitigated.

9 Appropriate offsetting plans will be
10 required to address residual serious harm to fish as
11 part of the Fisheries Act authorization process for the
12 Jay Project, if the project is per -- is approved to
13 proceed.

14 Fisheries and Oceans Canada will
15 continue to engage with Dominion Diamond and
16 stakeholders, including potentially impacted
17 communities, to ensure that interests for the
18 protection of fish and fish habitat are being
19 addressed, and that appropriate mitigation measures,
20 follow-up and monitoring programs are implemented, that
21 an offsetting plan is developed that is adequate and
22 acceptable to Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the
23 affected communities, and all other inconsistencies or
24 inadequacies in information as identified by Fisheries
25 and Oceans Canada are addressed.

1 I would like to note, again, that
2 Dominion Diamond has accepted all of our
3 recommendations. And we are confident that our un --
4 that our outstanding issues related to the assessment
5 and mitigation of potential impacts to fish and their
6 habitats will be resolved during to, or prior to --
7 prior to and during the regulatory phase. Thank you.

8

9 QUESTION PERIOD:

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Questions
11 from the Monitoring Agency?

12 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
13 agency. Just two (2) questions.

14 On the Fish Offsetting Plan that Julie
15 just mentioned, as the continued viability of healthy
16 populations of valued fish species are especially
17 important to Aboriginal communities, the agency is
18 wondering:

19 Will fisheries and Oceans be seeking
20 like for like species offsetting projects to replace
21 the species production that is estimated to be lost due
22 to Jay?

23 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
24 and Oceans. Our intention is always first and foremost
25 to replace habitats for the fish that are being

1 impacted. So we will certainly be looking at
2 opportunities within Lac du Sauvage to offset the lost
3 imp -- the -- the lost habitat.

4 We recognize that where the Jay pipe is,
5 because there is a kimberlite pipe there, it tends to
6 be quite deep, so it has been identified as -- as an
7 overwintering area. There is also one (1) shoal that
8 has been identified that will be lost due to the dike
9 footprint.

10 And so the target would be to ensure
11 that we would address any -- any limitations therefore
12 in overwintering habitat. And as we heard earlier,
13 there was a question about, Is there adequate spawning
14 habitat within Lac du Sauvage? Well, that can
15 certainly be addressed in a -- in an offsetting plan,
16 whereby the shoals to be -- the shoal to be impacted,
17 the one (1) shoal to be lost has been identified has
18 hav -- being of fair quality.

19 You could always offset a fair quality
20 shoal with an excellent quality shoal.

21 MR. TIM BYERS: And our final question
22 is: Does Fisheries and Oceans feel that Dominion
23 Diamonds's baseline data is now complete enough to be
24 able to adequately identify significant adverse impacts
25 to fish health, should the Jay project proceed?

1 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
2 and Oceans. We're -- we are -- we are aware of
3 numerous studies on fish and fish habitat that have
4 been undertaken in Lac du Sauvage from about '97 to
5 about 2012. So there is a -- a lot of baseline data on
6 the fish, the fish populations, the assemblages, and
7 their habitat use.

8 So, yes, I do believe we have enough
9 baseline data in order to do the -- do our assessment.

10 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you. No further
11 questions from the agency.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Government of the
13 Northwest Territories, questions?

14 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
15 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with ENR. We have no
16 questions.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
18 Yellowknives Dene First Nation?

19 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Randy Freeman,
20 Yellowknives Dene. I have no questions.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Lutsel K'e
22 Dene First Nation?

23 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
24 K'e Dene First Nation. As we've mentioned earlier, not
25 all fish habitat is equal for -- for us in terms of

1 traditional value.

2 Beyond consultation with Aboriginal
3 communities, do you have any mechanism for
4 incorporating traditional values in terms of fish
5 habitat? Thank you.

6 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
7 and Oceans. Certainly, if during the -- the
8 consultation on the authorization approach and the
9 offsetting plan, we would take into account habitat
10 value from a traditional use perspective as well as
11 from a fish perspective, and that could lead into when
12 we assess the habitat loss, it may mean that the
13 particular habitat being impacted is valued higher than
14 it would have been, had it been in another location of
15 the lake.

16 So certainly, we would take that into
17 account.

18 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
19 K'e Dene First Nation, no further questions. Thank
20 you.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Tlicho
22 Government?

23 MS. GRACE MACKENZIE: Grace Mackenzie,
24 Tlicho Government. I have a couple questions.

25 DFO recommends that the Company meet

1 with communities and DFO on conceptual offsetting
2 plans. I'd like to know: How open is DFO to
3 offsetting plans occurring in the context of the
4 communities rather in the Jay pipe region?

5 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
6 and Oceans.

7 We certainly do take -- take into
8 account ideas that we get from the communities for
9 habitat restoration projects, or habitat enhancement
10 projects. We know that for other projects, for
11 example, the -- the Lynx project that was recently
12 approved, the offsetting is actually being undertaken
13 via a stream restoration project in Lutsel K'e.

14 So we -- we tend to want to look at
15 onsite to see what we can do first and foremost for the
16 fish that are impacted, but if there's anything else
17 that we can do that's a community-based project, we
18 certainly would do that. And we -- we certainly have
19 done that in the past.

20 MS. GRACE MACKENZIE: Thank you for
21 that. Another question is:

22 How can communities bring forward their
23 recommendations for offsetting, and how will DFO make
24 the plans and offsetting options clear and transparent
25 to the communities?

1 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
2 and Oceans. We -- we have to keep in mind first of all
3 that this is the -- this is the Proponent's offsetting
4 plan. They are responsible for developing this plan,
5 and they're responsible for making sure that -- that
6 Aboriginal groups are in support of the plan that they
7 have.

8 And when we look at it, we will ask
9 those questions, and then that may -- means that when
10 we are consulting on -- on our regulatory instruments
11 and the plan, we know that it has garnered some -- some
12 support from the communities.

13 So certainly during those community
14 meetings, the opportunities are there to bring forth
15 the ideas so we can make sure that those are -- are
16 considered.

17 MS. GRACE MACKENZIE: Grace Mackenzie,
18 Tlicho Government. That's all the questions we have.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
20 Environment Canada?

21 MR. BRADLEY SUMMERFIELD: Bradley
22 Summerfield, Environment Canada. No questions.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North
24 Slave Metis Alliance?

25 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North

1 Slave Metis Alliance. We have no questions.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Deninu Kue
3 First Nation?

4 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc d'Entremont
5 for the DKFN. We do have a couple questions.

6 First, does Fisheries and Oceans Canada
7 consider the use of bottomless culverts for stream
8 crossing construction a best management practice that
9 would avoid serious harm to fish?

10 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
11 and Oceans. We typically don't dictate the
12 construction method. However, we do recognize that a
13 bottomless culvert does preserve stream bottom
14 substrate.

15 So in some cases, it might be a more
16 appropriate approach to take, but there have been other
17 large culverts where you can actually put substrate in
18 the culvert to mimic the -- the stream bottom, and it
19 may end up having the same result as an open bottom
20 culvert.

21 But we wouldn't dictate one over the
22 other. We would have to assess what was put forth, and
23 if the impacts were too great, we would -- we might
24 recommend a -- an approach that had a -- a lower impact
25 on the stream.

1 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
2 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. Thank you for that answer.

3 We also had a -- a similar question to
4 what the Tlicho Government asked in terms of offset
5 options closer to the communities, and we're happy to
6 hear that the -- the answer that DFO provided. So with
7 that, we -- we have no further questions. Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fort
9 Resolution Metis Council? Questions, Transport Canada?

10 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSUN: Anita
11 Gudmundsun, with Transport Canada. We have no
12 questions. Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Dominion
14 Diamond?

15 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
16 Dominion Diamond. No, I think we agree with all the
17 recommendations with -- from DFO, and particularly the
18 ones on engagement on -- on fish-out and -- and
19 offsetting plans.

20 And -- and I know the questions went to
21 DFO, but we do plan meetings and workshops in each of
22 the communities to talk about those two (2) issues.
23 Not a question; a comment, so hopefully I don't get in
24 too much trouble with the Chair. I have no questions.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: You're out of line.

1 Questions or -- or -- questions or comments from Review
2 Board staff and counsel?

3 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Mark Cliffe-
4 Phillips, with the Review Board.

5 We understand that Dominion has accepted
6 the recommendations of DFO, and we understand that DFO
7 believes that all these recommendations would limit
8 impacts on fish and fish habitat if implemented.

9 But are there any of DFO's
10 recommendations that do not fall under the authority of
11 the Fisheries authorization, the supplemental fish-out
12 plan, and offsetting plan? And, if so, which ones and
13 would they have any likely significant impacts on fish
14 or fish habitat?

15 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
16 and Oceans. I -- I may take a couple of minutes to go
17 through, but I -- I don't believe that any of our
18 recommendations were related to anything that wouldn't
19 be related to our mandate. Because we -- we talked
20 about blasting, which -- which relates to the death of
21 fish. We talked about diversion, which is under
22 Section 20, "Passage of Fish."

23 We talked about water levels, which we
24 want -- we -- from the perspective of avoiding impacts
25 on passage and loss of fish habitat. The conceptual

1 Fish-out Plan certainly is part of it. So, no, I would
2 say that none of them are outside of our mandate.

3 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: It's John Donihee,
4 Board counsel.

5 As I understand the presentation you've
6 given, it's clear that the offset arrangements, what
7 exactly will happen in -- in terms of offsetting either
8 loss of habitat or fish productivity, are -- those --
9 those details are yet to be worked out.

10 And so from the standpoint of the Board
11 in an impact assessment context, I guess I'd simply ask
12 you to confirm that from the standpoint of DFO, that
13 the losses to habitat and productivity are going to be
14 taken care of through the regulatory process that
15 you're responsible for.

16 So that in -- from the Board's
17 standpoint, they can safely conclude that those impacts
18 will be mitigated, even though we don't know exactly
19 what the answer is yet. But that mitigation is
20 required by the regulatory system.

21 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl -- excuse
22 me. Julie Dahl, Fisheries and Oceans. Thank you for
23 the -- for the question, John.

24 Yes, certainly, at the project review
25 stage, it's rare that we have all of the details at the

1 EA stage. Those are -- the final detailir -- details
2 are part of the regulatory process. And so at this
3 stage, we have identified the potential for the death
4 of fish. We have identified the loss of overwintering
5 habitat. We have identified the loss of a -- of a fair
6 quality spawning habitat.

7 So from a fish and fish habitat
8 perspective, we have technically identified what --
9 what habitat is likely to be lost. And we know that
10 there are tried and trues -- tried and true measures
11 that you can implement to offset those -- those habitat
12 features in terms of putting them back in.

13 What hasn't been worked out that had --
14 will have to be worked out in the details of the
15 offsetting plan at the regulatory phase is to add that
16 extra cultural significance of those particular areas
17 when you're trying to determine the extent of
18 offsetting that's required.

19 What the best approach -- like, where
20 should you be putting the offsetting? Looking at the
21 extent in -- in Lac du Sauvage, does it make sense to
22 put it all back into Lac du Sauvage to benefit the
23 fish? It might. There might be a good argument to
24 say, No, we only need part of it, and you need to
25 address something elsewhere. So that -- the -- the

1 cultural aspect will have to come at the -- at the
2 detailed offsetting plan stage.

3 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: This is John Donihee
4 again. Thank -- thank you for that answer.

5 I guess I would just want to summarize,
6 and you can disagree if I have put words in your mouth.
7 But -- but essentially, what you're saying is that what
8 is lost will -- will be mitigated, will be replaced,
9 one (1) -- one (1) way or the other in one (1) place or
10 another through the regulatory process to the
11 satisfaction of -- of DFO.

12 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
13 -- Fisheries and Oceans. That is correct.

14 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Madam Chair,
15 Mark Cliffe-Phillips, with the Review Board. No
16 further questions from staff or counsel.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
18 Board members? Yvonne...?

19 MS. YVONNE DOOLITTLE: Yvonne
20 Doolittle, Review Board. Thank you for your
21 presentation.

22 The only question I had was I didn't see
23 anything previously today or a discussion about winter
24 habitat of fish. So in Lac du Sauvage, you said that
25 it was in the Jay area where the winter area for the

1 fish were. How deep is that -- is that area need to be
2 for a winter habitat?

3 I can -- I can understand you that might
4 be able to replace a shoal or rebuild something along a
5 shoreline close by for -- for their eggs and deal with
6 dust fall issues and that. However, what about winter
7 habitat? Is there another -- is there other spots in
8 the lake there that are of equal use and desire for
9 these fish? Because I would assume that like other
10 deep lakes where we have amazing fish in the North,
11 those areas are vital to their longevity. Thank you.

12 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
13 and Oceans. The -- there isn't a specific depth that
14 you would say, It is good for overwintering. We know
15 that where there is -- where there are kimberlite
16 pipes, it tends to be really deep areas of the lake by
17 -- you tend to find them as these really deep areas.

18 So because it is deep, it is -- it's
19 expected that it's -- you know, it's below the ice
20 level, and it could be 8 to 10 metres. I'm not sure of
21 the exact -- I'm not sure of the exact -- up to 24
22 metres there. So if it's up to 24 metres in that area.
23 But any area that -- that is deeper than -- than
24 probably 8 to 10 metres would be suitable for fish for
25 overwintering. I don't have all the details of where

1 all the deep holes in the lake are. I do have a
2 bathymetry map. I'm not sure whether Dominion Diamond
3 could respond and -- and let you know how many deep
4 holes there are in the -- in the area for
5 overwintering.

6 MS. YVONNE DOOLITTLE: I was just to --
7 to -- I -- I guess, knowing how many lakes, but I was
8 just thinking about preferences for where there -- are
9 there other areas where there's known preferences for
10 fish to have winter habitat?

11 Do you -- are you guys aware of that?

12 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
13 and Oceans. I -- I'm not aware of winter studies of
14 where the fish are. But looking at the bathymetry map,
15 there are several areas that are 12 metres or deeper,
16 and the -- the fish would preferentially seek out those
17 deep areas.

18 So it certainly wouldn't be limiting in
19 -- in the lake.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Bertha...?

24 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Thank you, Madam
25 Chair. Bertha Norwegian.

1 I just had a -- a question with respect
2 to the documents that we have from your office. It
3 indicates that there's going to be nine (9) water
4 crossings on seven (7) streams.

5 And I'm just wondering, if they're going
6 to be building little bridges across these streams, how
7 -- how large are the streams? If there's going to be
8 any building or whatever, is it going to occur during
9 the winter season?

10 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
11 and Oceans. So far, Dominion Diamond had identified
12 that they will require crossings on water courses for
13 their road, however, the details about the exact method
14 of the crossing has not been finalized.

15 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Just another
16 question. Bertha Norwegian.

17 Do you have any idea at all about the
18 strength of these streams, the depth, the width?

19 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
20 and Oceans. I believe we do have the data on the
21 streams, I just don't have it handy right now, but we
22 do have the data. And all of that data, the -- the
23 Company has -- has agreed to providing all the details
24 -- des -- detailed design based on flow and -- and
25 requirements for stability and the proper design. So

1 they have committed to providing all of that
2 information.

3 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Bertha
4 Norwegian, from the Board. It's -- in the reading that
5 I've done, it seems to suggest that some of these
6 streams, while they may be not very deep, they do have
7 fish that are low to the -- to the bottom, shall we
8 say.

9 And I wondered whether or not there were
10 going to be any fish-out activities or anything like
11 that on -- out at the streams as opposed to the lakes?

12 MS. JULIE DAHL: Fisheries and Oceans,
13 Julie Dahl. There would be no intention to remove fish
14 from the streams for crossings.

15 Best management practices would be
16 required to make sure that there was no impact to the
17 fish, such as maintaining flow around the -- around
18 while the crossing is being built, controlling the
19 release of sediment, all those sorts of things to make
20 sure that the fish were not impacted and that when the
21 project was finished there was free passage of fish
22 afterwards and that the crossing is stable.

23 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Thank you very
24 much. Bertha Norwegian. I just have one (1) more
25 question.

1 Do you have any idea about what kind of
2 materials they will be using to build these crossings?

3 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
4 and Oceans. By 'materials', do you mean the -- the
5 materials to stabilize the crossing or what --

6 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Yes.

7 MS. JULIE DAHL: Typically, if -- if
8 they do use culverts, typically rock is used at the
9 inlet and the outlet of the culverts to avoid erosion
10 from the -- from the water. So typically some rock
11 will be -- will be placed along the in-stream and the
12 inlet and outlet of the -- of the culvert to avoid
13 erosion. Other than that, there shouldn't be any other
14 materials placed in the stream.

15 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: What about on
16 top of the culvert?

17 MS. JULIE DAHL: I'd expect that the
18 road would -- would be -- would be constructed overtop
19 of the culvert.

20 MS. BERTHA NORWEGIAN: Okay.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your
25 presentation. We would like to now call Yellowknives

1 Dene First Nation. You can either do it at the table
2 if you're at the front. If you need to use the --

3

4

(BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 PRESENTATION BY YELLOWKNIVES DENE FIRST NATION:

7

MR. ALEX POWER: Alex Power,

8

Yellowknives Dene First Nation. First I'd like to

9

thank the Board and the -- the Chair for their

10

accommodation, it's greatly appreciated. So I'm just

11

going to jump ahead to this slide because it's the only

12

one I like. And I'm -- I'm not a fan of slides or

13

PowerPoint.

14

So the first thing I want to address is

15

-- is the modelling. And, you know, the -- a lot -- a

16

lot of what's gone on today, and -- and yesterday even,

17

it's been -- been about modelling. And so I had this

18

quote which I've always liked.

19

With four (4) parameters I can fit an

20

elephant, and with five (5) I can make him wiggle his

21

trunk. And so this is John Von Neumann, who's probably

22

one (1) of the most important mathematicians of the

23

20th Century and worked on -- actually, he was one (1)

24

of the first people -- maybe the first person to use

25

the Monte Carlo model with a computer.

1 Interestingly, he also worked on the
2 development of the nuclear bomb with uranium that came
3 from Port Radium, so it's a small world. And if -- if
4 you can take anything from this other than just my
5 trying to sow the seed of doubt in the, I guess,
6 predictive -- predictive -- predict -- I don't know,
7 this is cutting out?

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MR. ALEX POWER: So if I can do
12 anything beyond just sort of putting a bit of doubt in
13 -- in modelling as -- as sort of the final word, it
14 would be to highlight sort of the connectivity between
15 things in time and space. So -- and -- and the reason
16 I want to do that is because it's really hard to
17 predict the future, right? And it's hard to know what
18 factors are going to come from where, and how they're
19 going to affect what it is you're doing.

20 And so in the case of trying to
21 establish, you know, a meromixis and -- and have this
22 be stable long-term, a number of people have covered
23 things such as the freeze up, and -- and the freshet,
24 so the -- the water melt in the spring as being factors
25 that can destabilize meromixis, or mixes. I don't -- I

1 don't know the grammar around plural on meromixis.

2 Other -- other things that were brought
3 up were the stability of permafrost, and how this can
4 affect water moving in and out of the meromictic lake,
5 or in the case of the Jay Pit, just the pit within the
6 lake, and how this has the potential to destabilize.

7 And now, the Proponent has gone to great
8 lengths to -- to really try to model these things and
9 take account for -- for it. And -- and, you know, I --
10 I commend that. It's not an easy task. But the fact
11 remains that you know -- you often don't know why
12 you're going to be wrong. And -- and it's hard to
13 know, if this were to fail, how -- how that would come
14 about. And, you know, it's because of this that
15 Yellowknives Dene really wants to reit -- reiterate
16 that the need for a contingency plan, a robust
17 contingency plan, is -- is really something that we're
18 looking for.

19 I -- I understand that, you know, the
20 model says it's very unlikely to fail. However, you
21 know, lakes like this have failed. You know, meromixes
22 do fail, and we -- we've seen examples of that. And
23 now, of course, the Proponent -- the Proponent has
24 tried to reassure us on -- on this, too, saying, Well,
25 you know, that this lake's different from those. And

1 this -- this -- these meromixes are -- are different
2 from those.

3 But they're also trying to reassure us
4 by saying, Well, this meromixis is -- is similar to
5 others. And -- and that's why it's going to be stable.
6 This isn't -- this isn't new, you know. We -- we've
7 seen this before. And I guess my response that is,
8 again, you can't have it both ways. It's either --
9 it's either different, so we don't know, or it's the
10 same. But you -- but you can't have both.

11 And so I know that -- a common refrain -
12 - refrain is that, you know, these -- this process is
13 too onerous and all these -- these conditions are too
14 onerous, and it -- and it discourages development of --
15 of projects like Jay.

16 And I think, again, YKDFN's response to
17 that would be, you know, it's -- it's very easy to --
18 to break things, but it's really hard to build them.
19 And that -- that goes for physical structures. It goes
20 for, you know, meromictic states, and it -- and it goes
21 for goodwill or good faith.

22 And I feel like -- or YKDFN feels that,
23 you know, Dominion has always been quite forthcoming.
24 And they've -- they've really -- they've really done a
25 good job engaging. And -- and that -- again, for that,

1 you know, I -- I commend their efforts. But the -- the
2 history of -- of mining and resource extraction in the
3 North isn't, you know, hasn't always been awesome. And
4 I think we can all -- we can all think of examples.

5 And, you know, the Yellowknives Dene
6 have really suffered extensively at -- at the hands of
7 that. And to go back to our friend, you know, John Von
8 Neumann, I think there's a lot of people who aren't --
9 aren't especially happy with the -- the legacy at Port
10 Radium. And then so we approach it from that position,
11 or from that angle, where we're, like, Okay, we
12 understand that it is very unlikely to fail. And the
13 Proponent has repeatedly said that a freshwater cap is
14 -- is the best solution.

15 But that -- that's why it's called a
16 Plan B. So Plan A, we know what you're Plan A is.
17 What -- what's Plan B when this -- you know, if this
18 were to fail? And, you know, no one -- no one goes in
19 planning for it to fail, but if in the event that it
20 does, we -- we want to see that fleshed out more.

21 And that's really what -- what -- that's
22 -- that's sort of our position on that. Because --
23 because we haven't seen that. And I -- I think that's
24 been expressed by -- by a number of people or a number
25 of parties that that needs to be fleshed out more.

1 What -- what's the contingency? What's the Plan B?

2 Because we'd all like if this worked, but if it

3 doesn't, then what?

4 So I'm just going to finish now on a

5 final note, which I'm -- I'm sort of pulling in from --

6 laterally. And -- and it's a -- a slight departure

7 from this. And it -- it -- it's sort of a follow-up to

8 a -- a question from Shin Shiga, with NSMA earlier,

9 asking about the -- the quality of the habitat in --

10 before and after the Jay pit at that site, so comparing

11 the -- the current habitat with what -- what would be

12 left afterwards.

13 And I'd like to take a stab at sort of

14 how I would answer that and I would say that it's

15 objectively worse after the fact. And -- and the

16 proponent stated that the -- the habitat would be

17 different and -- and that's -- that's for sure, it

18 would different, but there -- there's nothing like a

19 salt-filled trench in this habitat right now, it's a --

20 a shallow lake.

21 So it's -- saying that it's different is

22 a little bit like building a sandpit in the jungle and

23 saying, Well, you know, it's -- it's a good habitat for

24 camels. It's just not -- it just doesn't fit, for me

25 anyways. So that's sort of the -- the last I have to

1 say about that.

2 So yeah, that's -- that's where I'd like
3 to finish off, just saying that -- surprise, the light.
4 You know, we understand that the Proponent has gone --
5 gone to great lengths with their -- with their
6 modelling and -- and it's -- you know, they know their
7 modelling. They -- they -- you know, Golder has
8 modelling chops, it's why they get these contracts.

9 You know, if they -- kudos, it's -- it's
10 great work, but there's things we don't know and it's
11 hard to predict them and what's Plan B? Thank you.

12

13 QUESTION PERIOD:

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
15 Questions, Monitoring Agency?

16 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, Monitoring
17 Agenc -- Monitoring Agency. We have no questions.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Government
19 of the Northwest Territories?

20 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
21 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with ENR. I'd like to
22 thank YKDFN for their presentation and we have no
23 questions.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Lutsel K'e
25 Dene First Nation?

1 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, LKDFN.
2 We'd like to thank YKDFN for their presentation. We
3 have no questions. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Tlicho
5 Government?

6 MS. MARJORIE MATHESON-MAUND: Tlicho
7 Government, Marjorie Matheson-Maund, no questions.
8 Thanks for your presentation.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
10 Environment Canada?

11 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin,
12 Environment Canada. We have no questions.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fisheries
14 and Oceans?

15 MS. VERONIQUE D'AMOURS GAUTHIER:
16 Veronique D'Amours Gauthier, we have no questions.
17 Fisheries and Oceans Canada, sorry.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North
19 Slave Metis Alliance?

20 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
21 Slave Metis Alliance. We have no questions.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Deninu Kue First
23 Nation, questions?

24 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
25 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. We have no questions.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fort
2 Resolution Metis Council?

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Transport
7 Canada?

8 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: Anita
9 Gudmundson, of Transport Canada. We have no questions.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Dominion
11 Diamond?

12 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
13 Dominion Diamond. Thank you, Alex, for the
14 presentation. No questions.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
16 Board staff and counsel?

17 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Mark Cliffe-
18 Phillips, Review Board. No questions from staff or
19 legal counsel.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
21 Board members? Thank you for your presentation.

22 MR. ALEX POWER: Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: If I could ask Deninu
24 Kue First Nations to the table please, for their
25 presentation.

1 PRESENTATION BY DKFN:

2 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Thank you, Madam
3 Chair. My name is Marc d'Entremont, for the DKFN.

4 Patrick Simon is also here, but I -- I think he just --
5 I don't know where he went at the moment, so...

6 And I also want to remind folks that we
7 still have Dr. Elmar Platt on the line and he's the one
8 (1) that prepared this presentation, but I will be
9 presenting it. Although, at the end I will ask him to
10 pipe up with any comments.

11 What we're going to present is
12 information that, for the most part, has already been
13 raised today through the other presentations and
14 discussions. We just want to highlight DKFN's concerns
15 and agreement with some of the recommendations from
16 some of the other parties plus a few other pieces of
17 information.

18 So first of all, about the -- kind of in
19 response to my -- my question to DFO about the whole
20 bottomless culvert thing. This first slide provides
21 that recommendation sort of formally about
22 consideration of -- of the use of bottomless culverts,
23 and it shows a couple photographs.

24 The first one is the conventional closed
25 culvert. You can see there's a trickle of water here.

1 Not much substrate involved there, probably pretty poor
2 conditions for fish. The bottom one is the open bottom
3 culvert, less disturbance on the streambed. Nat --
4 more natural conditions, just to give you that sense of
5 kind of what we've been talking about.

6 Also in regard to kind of preserving and
7 maintaining as much fish habitat as possible when it
8 comes to the construct of the diversion, we would
9 recommend that there's an inclusion of sort of large
10 boulders placed within that diversion channel to also
11 kind of maintain some level of ecological function and
12 not just have a sterile channel that -- that is kind of
13 less attractive for fish, so something that will sort
14 of maintain a bit more natural conditions.

15 And also -- and, like, we -- we're in
16 support of DFO's request, too, about having the ability
17 to review the design plans for the channel as well as
18 all the other fish habitat offset measures, as well,
19 so. And I believe Dominion Diamond's just committed to
20 that.

21 So again, this one's in regards to the
22 water level -- potential water level changes with the
23 narrows that's been raised again. And we'd just like
24 to reiterate to the Board that there would be
25 consideration of a direct measure that addresses that -

1 - that particular issue.

2 When it comes to the fish-out, we would
3 recommend that all fish that are kind of captured,
4 whether it's -- whether they're salvaged, moved, or --
5 or succumb to mortality in the event of the fish-out,
6 that they're -- they're enumerated, they're all
7 counted, and that this information be shared with all
8 parties with the intent that having a good number -- a
9 good count of the number of fish that are affected will
10 then influence what goes into the off-set plan.

11 Our next measure is -- recommended
12 measure is with regards to the resuspension of fines
13 within the silt curtain area. So when -- during -- af
14 -- I guess, after construction, assuming that there's
15 some silt curtains up around -- I guess on the outside
16 of where the dike is constructed to -- to -- as a
17 protection measure so that silt doesn't get into the
18 Lac du Sauvage, we anticipate that there will be a
19 certain layer of silt in-between the dike and the silt
20 curtain.

21 So before these silt curtains are
22 actually removed, that there's some -- there is some
23 sort of quantification of the accumulation of fines
24 that have been deposited between the dike and the silt
25 curtain and that this amount of silt is actually

1 monitored and managed prior to or during removal of the
2 silt curtain so that that sediment then doesn't
3 actually get released into the lake.

4 And then on to the meromictic
5 conditions. So we've heard several times throughout
6 the day about the concerns regarding whether the meromi
7 -- meromictic conditions will be realized. We've heard
8 about the modelling. We've heard about, like I say,
9 the concerns. We again just want to reiterate. We
10 have concerns about those conditions forming and
11 maintaining pri -- primarily during closure and at the
12 closure stage.

13 We're in support of Lutsel K'e's
14 recommendation that an -- an independent panel or body
15 or experts kind of look at this whole situation, and
16 that the Review Board undertake that prior to making
17 your decision.

18 And the -- a couple of points there. So
19 as you said, duration -- enclosure or the stability of
20 the meromictic conditions in -- in Jay and Misery pits.
21 And the fact that some monitoring needs to be happen to
22 ascertain whether the -- that -- that there's no mixing
23 actually happening between the -- the chemocline.

24 However, we want to point out that there
25 -- there are sort of factors in play that -- that do

1 influence the exchange of water through the chemocline.
2 And this slide just shows some of those examples in
3 terms of, you know, disposal of waste diffusion, local
4 turbulent mixing, resuspension, and ebullition or
5 bubbling. So there are some processes that'll occur in
6 the pits. And when it's, you know, getting into the
7 meromictic condition that will facilitate, I guess,
8 like, the -- the movement and exchange of water between
9 the -- the different layers.

10 And on this slide we just, again, want
11 to re -- re-emphasize that there are other examples of
12 -- of pit lakes where meromictic conditions have been
13 predicted. But during the observations some of those
14 conditions haven't been realized. And -- and I'd just
15 refer back to Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation's
16 presentation, you know, showed some aerial photographs
17 of what some -- some of these pits look like for
18 reference. And you can see on here that some of them
19 have achieved meromictic states. Some are still
20 uncertain, and others are not.

21 For this measure, we -- we just want to
22 support IEMA's recommendation that there's non-lethal
23 large fish tissue sampling con -- being completed as --
24 as part of the toxicity testing for metals and -- and
25 such. And then finally, we'd like to recommend that

1 the measure be included that in addition to acute
2 toxicity testing that there is also chronic toxic --
3 toxicity testing implemented, just to test the mine
4 effluent, just as an additional measure for, kind of,
5 fish protection. So that -- that's our final slide. I
6 will kind of open up to Elmar to see if he has a bit
7 more information to share.

8 DR. ELMAR PLATE (BY PHONE): First of
9 all, can you hear me? This is Elmar Plate, Deninu
10 K'ue.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, we can.

12 DR. ELMAR PLATE (BY PHONE): Thank you.
13 First of all, thank you, Marc. That was a very --
14 almost exactly what I would have said. I just wanted
15 to add a few questions -- a few comments, I mean.
16 There was earlier a comment by Envi -- or a question to
17 Environment Canada how much tissue is needed in large
18 fish for to test for more than mercury.

19 And if you want to test for a whole slew
20 of metals, including aluminum, cadmium, callium,
21 copper, lead, magnesium, nick -- nickel, and zinc you
22 need about 1 gram of fish tissue, based on my
23 experience. So that should be doable when testing
24 larger fish.

25 So that's one (1) comment I wanted to

1 make. And then earlier there was a question posed to
2 other repre -- representatives or presenters for First
3 Nations. What we would like to see as an outcome or
4 something that would be of significance at the end.
5 And I'm glad for the agreement that the phosphorous
6 level in the water that's overlaying the very high
7 salinity water will be tried to be capped or the -- the
8 -- by -- at about 0.01 milligrams per litre, which will
9 leave the lake at a oligotrophic state. That's
10 definitely one (1) big concern. And that could change
11 the whole nature of this lake.

12 Another one (1) is I am agreeing with
13 many of the other speakers before. Water treatment
14 should be considered as a contingency if the meromictic
15 condition doesn't happen quite as stable, or is not
16 quite as stable as hoped.

17 And the third is that meaningful
18 offsetting for the losses of habitat and fish. It's
19 definitely one of the main concern that I would see
20 from my point of view. Thank you.

21 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Thanks, Elmer,
22 for those comments. So that con -- concludes our
23 presentation of our recommended measures, and Patrick
24 just wants to close out with a couple more words.
25 Thank you.

1 MR. PATRICK SIMON: Thank you, Madam
2 Chairperson. Patrick Simon, Deninu Kue First Nation.
3 I'm a counsellor. I'm also a deputy mayor, so I
4 consider myself a small leader of my people. And I --
5 and I just wanted to reflect a couple of sentiments.

6 One is that the -- the mindset of our
7 people is that the water and the fish there before the
8 mines should be returned back to the state -- the same
9 state after the mines leave.

10 We also feel very privileged and
11 fortunate to -- to be here to -- to give you our issues
12 and our concerns. And we hope that we have been
13 dignified, honest, and clear, and respectful, and that
14 we recognized everybody in this room.

15 So, Madam Chair, I thank you. I thank
16 your Board. I thank the Board staff, and the Company
17 for helping us as much as you could. I also thank all
18 the members that presented, or asked questions, or to
19 be honest, taught me a lot. And every time I come here
20 I get a little bit smarter, and one day maybe I'll be
21 able to do this myself. But I -- I just wanted to say
22 these things because that's the Dene way.

23 We have to say thank you, and we have to
24 be respectful. We have to be recognizable. We have to
25 recognize people. And we have to end in a good, good

1 way. So thank you very much. I feel very good. My
2 body is tired but the mind and heart is good. And I
3 thank you all for that. Masi cho.

4

5 QUESTION PERIOD:

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Masi cho.
7 Questions from the Monitoring Agency?

8 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, Monitoring
9 Agency. Thank you for your presentation. We have no
10 questions.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Government
12 of the Northwest Territories?

13 MR. NATHEN RICHA: Thank you, Madam
14 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with ENR. Thank you for
15 the presentation. We have no questions.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
17 Yellowknives Dene First Nation?

18 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Randy Freeman,
19 Yellowknives Dene. I have no questions.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Lutsel K'e
21 Dene First Nation?

22 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
23 K'e Dene First Nation. I'd like to thank Deninu Kue
24 for their presentation, but I have no questions. Thank
25 you.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Tlicho
2 Government?

3 MS. MARJORIE MATHESON-MAUND: Tlicho
4 Government, Marjorie Matheson-Maund. No questions and
5 thank you for your presentation.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
7 Environment Canada?

8 MS. MEAGAN TOBIN: Meagan Tobin,
9 Environment Canada. No questions.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fisheries
11 and Oceans Canada?

12 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
13 and Oceans Canada. I don't have a question but I do --
14 I was wondering if I could just make a comment in
15 response to one of the recommendations in the
16 presentation? It was with regards to the
17 recommendation that all fish be enumerated from the
18 fishout.

19 The -- we have -- DFO has developed a
20 fishout protocol, and that protocol dictates that all
21 fish need to be counted, measured, identified that come
22 out of the fishout. The fishout also defines a
23 systematic approach to collecting the fish such that we
24 can compare the fishout -- the numbers of fish caught
25 during the fishout to the estimates of fish populations

1 that were in the area. And it also helps to determine
2 when the fishout is deemed complete.

3 So there is a formal protocol that will
4 be applied, and -- and certainly all the data on the
5 fish is collected and that does inform the offsetting
6 plan.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North
8 Slave Metis Alliance?

9 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
10 Slave Metis Alliance. Thank you for your presentation.
11 We have no questions.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fort
13 Resolution Metis Council? Questions, Transport Canada?

14 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: Anita
15 Gudmundson, with Transport Canada. We have no
16 questions. Thank you.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Dominion
18 Diamond?

19 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
20 Dominion Diamond. I'd like to thank Patrick and Marc.
21 I -- I do -- actually do have a question.

22 We -- we hadn't planned on commenting on
23 this, and this is an issue raised by Lutsel K'e Dene
24 First Nation too in terms of the independent review
25 panels that review the meromictic conditions. And I

1 noticed you also have or, alternatively, the hiring of
2 an independent expert, Marc, in your presentation.

3 When we looked at this, it seemed pretty
4 clear to us that this issue fell within the -- the
5 mandate of the Wek'eezhii Land and Water Board, and
6 that was the proper independent board to -- to review
7 this, you know, in a -- in a very public way.

8 I'm just wondering, isn't one (1) of the
9 options -- wouldn't one (1) of the options to satisfy
10 your -- your issue here be for the -- that Board, that
11 independent, regulatory board to review this? And if
12 they required an independent expert to provide advice,
13 they could certainly -- they certainly have the ability
14 to go out and get independent advice, similar to the
15 Review Board.

16 Wouldn't that be an option that would
17 sort of help deal with the concern here?

18 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
19 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. So the way I'd answer that,
20 Richard, I think if -- if we in ourselves wanted to get
21 an expert advice on it, we would have gone out and --
22 and gotten it and provided that to everybody here.

23 We kind of raise it in this form
24 because, like I said, there's been lots of issues and
25 concerns raised about this topic. And the Review Board

1 needs to make a -- a decision it, and so that was our
2 recommendation that if -- if the Review Board feels the
3 need, that -- well, there's two (2) things.

4 They either feel they have -- they have
5 enough information to make a decision on it or they
6 don't. And if they don't, then one (1) option is to --
7 to get an expert, independent expert advice on it.

8 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
9 K'e Dene First Nation. May I add to that, please?

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: No, I'm sorry, you
11 can't.

12 MR. RICHARD BARGERY: Richard Bargery,
13 Dominion Diamond. I expect we'll have a chance to
14 discuss this in -- in -- on Saturday, Peter. But I
15 have -- I have no other -- no further questions. Thank
16 you.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
18 Board staff and counsel?

19 MR. MARK CLIFFE-PHILLIPS: Mark Cliffe-
20 Phillips, Review Board. No questions from the staff or
21 counsel.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
23 Questions, Board members? Thank you very much for your
24 presentation.

25 Our next presentation is Transport

1 Canada. Before we -- but while Transport Canada is
2 coming up, I would like to mention that the translators
3 -- I don't think we have anyone here that needs
4 translation, so they would like to go home. It's been
5 a long day for them, and we truly appreciate your
6 translation and the work that you have done for us for
7 the past three (3) days. Thank you.

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 PRESENTATION BY TRANSPORT CANADA:

12 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: Thank you, Madam
13 Chair. My name is Anita Gudmundson, and I'm the
14 regional manager with Transport Canada's environmental
15 services in our prairie and northern region.

16 With me today is Chris Aguire, and Chris
17 is an environmental officer with Transport Canada, also
18 in our prairie and northern region.

19 I would first like to thank the Board
20 for providing Transport Canada with the opportunity to
21 speak at the proceedings today. Today, our
22 presentation will be a very brief summary of Transport
23 Canada's technical report filed with the Board in July.

24 Transport Canada administers a variety
25 of acts and regulations, and may issue approvals for

1 works that may affect transportation. Key legislation
2 related to the Jay Project includes the Navigation
3 Protection Act, the Aeronautics Act, and Transportation
4 of Dangerous Goods Act.

5 In consideration of the information
6 provided by Dominion Diamond throughout the review
7 process, components of interest to Transport Canada
8 include dikes, water intakes, and outfalls, temporary
9 in waterworks, dewatering of Lac du Sauvage,
10 transportation of dangerous goods, and aerodrome
11 certification.

12 The following slides will briefly speak
13 to our recommendations provided in our technical
14 report. During the Information Request stage,
15 Transport Canada recommended that Dominion Diamond
16 provide addition information to Transport Canada to
17 assist us in determining the applicability of the
18 Navigation Protection Act to the project.

19 During the Information Request stage,
20 Dominion Diamond did identified that addi -- additional
21 information will be provided during the permitting
22 phase of the project. The information provided will be
23 used by Transport Canada -- Canada to complete a
24 navigation assessment and to further support our
25 determination in the applicability of the Navigation

1 Protection Act.

2 Transport Canada has no concerns with
3 specific project activities related to our roles and
4 responsibilities under the Transportation of Dangerous
5 Goods Act. Transport Canada recommends Dominion
6 Diamond consult the Transportation of Dangerous Goods
7 Act and regulations and comply with all requirements.

8 Dominion Diamond may contact Transport
9 Canada Transportation of Dangerous Goods regional
10 office for a clarification or guidance.

11 Transport Canada has no concerns with
12 specific project activities related to our roles and
13 responsibilities related to aviation safety regulation.
14 Transport Canada recommends that if Dominion Diamond
15 plans to certify their aerodrome as an airport, that it
16 meets the requirements of CARs 302 and its associated
17 standards, including wildlife planning and management
18 and emergency response planning.

19 In conclusion, Dominion Diamond has been
20 responsive to Transport Canada's recommendations raised
21 through the review process. Transport Canada looks
22 forward to continued dialogue and cooperation with the
23 Board, other federal and territory government agencies,
24 stakeholders, and the Proponent. Thank you.

25

1 QUESTION PERIOD:

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Questions
3 from the Monitoring Agency?

4 MR. TIM BYERS: Tim Byers, with the
5 Monitoring Agency. Just one (1) quick question.

6 The Navigation Protection Act, is that a
7 new Act that replaces the Navigable Waters Act, or is
8 that strictly regarding aviation?

9 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: So the Navigable
10 Waters Protection Act was revised. And it --

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Just state your name
12 again, please.

13 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: Oh, I'm sorry.
14 Anita Gudmundson, with Transport Canada.

15 So in 2014, the Navigable Water
16 Protection Act was revised. The revisions included a
17 change to the name of the Act. So it is now called the
18 Navigation Protection Act, so it is the same Act with
19 changes.

20 One (1) of the changes specific to the
21 Act that is important in this project is that the Act
22 now lists -- includes a list of navigable waters where
23 any proposed work that could interfere with navigation
24 must receive approval -- approval and comply with the
25 Act.

1 MR. TIM BYERS: Thank you. There will
2 be no -- Tim Byers, with the agency. There'll be no
3 more questions. However, we would like to thank very
4 much the Board for your patience with our presentation
5 and our questions.

6 And we would just like to let folks know
7 that the community -- community hearings, the agency
8 will provide a director at each of those, not to
9 present, but to act more like a resource for the local
10 people. Thank you.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions from the
12 Government of the Northwest Territories?

13 MR. NATHEN RICHEA: Thank you, Madam
14 Chair. It's Nathen Richea, with ENR. We have no
15 questions.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
17 Yellowknives Dene First Nation?

18 MR. RANDY FREEMAN: Randy Freeman,
19 Yellowknives Dene. I have no questions.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Lutsel K'e
21 Dene First Nation?

22 MR. PETER UNGER: Peter Unger, Lutsel
23 K'e Dene First Nation. Thank you for the presentation.
24 No questions.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Tlicho

1 Government?

2 MS. MARJORIE MATHESON-MAUND: Marjorie
3 Matheson-Maund, Tlicho Government. No questions.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions,
5 Environment Canada?

6 MR. BRADLEY SUMMERFIELD: Bradley
7 Summerfield, Environment Canada. No questions.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fisheries
9 and Oceans Canada?

10 MS. JULIE DAHL: Julie Dahl, Fisheries
11 and Oceans Canada. No questions.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, North
13 Slave Metis Alliance?

14 MR. SHIN SHIGA: Shin Shiga, North
15 Slave Metis Alliance. We have no questions.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Deninu Kue
17 First Nation?

18 MR. MARC D'ENTREMONT: Marc
19 d'Entremont, for the DKFN. We have no questions.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Fort
21 Resolution Metis Council? Questions, Transport Canada?
22 It's a long day, sorry. Dominion -- questions,
23 Dominion Diamond?

24 MR. RICHARD BARGER: Richard Barger,
25 Dominion Diamond. No questions.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
2 Board staff and members -- or counsel?

3 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: It's John Donihee,
4 Board counsel. I -- I have one (1) question, and that
5 is: Does the Navigation Protection Act apply to Lac du
6 Sauvage?

7 MS. ANITA GUDMUNDSON: Thank you for
8 your question. Anita Gudmundson, with Transport
9 Canada.

10 At this time Transport Canada has not
11 been able to make a determination as to whether the
12 Navigation Protection Act applies to Lac du Sauvage and
13 the project. Once we receive the additional
14 information from the Proponent we will be able to make
15 an assessment as to navigability of the -- of Lac du
16 Sauvage. And then we will be able to make a
17 determination if the Act applies.

18 MR. JOHN DONIHEE: John Donihee. Thank
19 you, Madam Chair. That's my only question.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Questions, Review
21 Board members?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if Kirby

1 was going to throw the book, or -- or what. Thank you
2 for your presentation. They are happy you're the last
3 one (1).

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't think -- I
8 don't think I've missed out any presentations, right?
9 Going once, twice, done. I'll just have some closing
10 remarks. We have arrived at the end of the formal
11 hearings for the Jay Project. And before the closing
12 hearings I will clarify the final process and steps for
13 parties and Dominion Diamond.

14 At the caribou hearing, Dominion
15 proposed a workshop to explore compensary (sic)
16 offsetting options that could further reduce potential
17 impacts from the Jay Project to caribou. The timing of
18 this offsetting workshop is early October. The Review
19 Board supports this initiative by Dominion, because it
20 seeks to resolve the outstanding issues.

21 During the next two (2) weeks Dominion
22 Diamond and the parties will submit post-hearing
23 filings that we have discussed and recorded, prior to
24 the closure of the public record. Post-hearing file --
25 filing material includes official hearing transcripts,

1 commitments, undertakings, and final statements from
2 parties and Dominion Diamond.

3 Post-hearing filing dates are as
4 follows: October 9th, undertakings from Dominion;
5 October 23rd, closing argument from parties; October
6 30th, closing argument from Dominion; October 30th,
7 closure of public record. In January 2016, the Review
8 Board submit -- submits reports of environmental
9 assessment to the GNWT Minister of Lands.

10 The Review Board will fully consider the
11 views of all parties and individuals who spoke at the
12 Review Board over the course of these hearings. Your
13 views and opinions will be considered in the Board's
14 deliberations and in its preparation of the report of
15 EA. In addition, the Review Board will consider all
16 material on the public record.

17 The Review Board will complete the
18 report of EA for the Jay Project in January of 2016.
19 The report will then be submitted to the GNWT Minister
20 of Lands for his or her consideration. The Board's
21 recommendation to the GNWT Minister of Lands will be
22 based on the evidence on the public record. This
23 includes written material submitted over the course of
24 this environmental assessment, as well as transcripts
25 from people who spoke during this community and public

1 hearings.

2 I would like to thank the following
3 individuals who helped to make this hearing successful.
4 Our caterers and -- and -- caterers who brought all the
5 beverages and snacks and food for us to keep us going.
6 Our interpreters who already deserted us and are home
7 putting their feet up, PIDO for the sound. We
8 appreciate all the good work that you've done, and
9 making our voices -- make sure that we're -- we have
10 been heard loud and clear.

11 And also to the Board members for your
12 diligence to sit here. And definitely for the staff
13 who have been helping us. To the girls at the front
14 there. Our staff who's been so gracious and bought us
15 cushions. Like we are being spoiled, so we appreciate
16 it.

17 So with that statement right now, I
18 would like to say that the formal hearings for the Jay
19 Project is officially closed. Thank you. Masi.

20

21 --- Upon adjourning at 7:16 p.m.

22

23

24

25

1 Certified correct,

2

3

4

5 _____

6 Robert Keeleghan, Mr.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

345				
<hr/>				
- 322:3	168:16	126:22	15 12:2 54:5	213:7
<hr/>	175:14	164:5	271:20	229:6
	181:17	185:12,15,	272:13	231:17
<hr/>	182:14	17,18,19	15,000	269:4
\$	185:22	191:5	97:14,23	284:18
\$63 249:21	191:19	211:17	16 1:24 9:8	295:13
<hr/>	194:18	219:22	110:16	302:22
0	196:17	220:22	196:18	333:3
0.01 266:12	199:3	221:22		341:21
327:8	215:22	223:5	160 9:11	2,925 205:9
01 282:25	222:5	244:21	17 127:6	20 163:22
03 55:5	224:4	258:3,24	173 9:12	286:13
08 55:5	228:13	307:20,24	18th 293:12	303:22
<hr/>	238:23	10,000	19 43:7	200 23:13
	239:13	93:17,18	1939 247:8	81:9 95:15
<hr/>	246:18	121:11,12,	1990s 70:11	96:9,15
1	248:3,14	25		209:4
1 29:5	256:17	10,000th	<hr/>	225:24
48:21,25	261:18,19	93:1	2	200,000
51:8	296:7,17	10:39 86:10		151:7
52:9,16	306:9	10:57 86:11	2 14:3,18	2006 70:9
53:13	310:24	100 102:6	19:8 22:15	2012 297:5
57:10,18	312:22,23	122:10	42:12 45:8	2013 70:9
58:1,22	321:8	224:24	48:3,4,20	2014 81:2
61:18	326:22,25	225:7	49:7 61:3	122:17
65:20	327:10,12	263:23	63:4,21	337:15
66:17	332:8,9	287:2,13,2	69:11	2015 1:24
69:12,13	333:6	4	71:25 72:9	11:4 39:6
73:13,14,1	337:5,20	10-metre	73:4,16,25	2016 290:17
8 76:15	340:4	54:8 56:17	89:6 96:6	342:7,18
83:2 88:11	341:3	11 9:3 11:1	110:17	2019 137:4
90:8	1,000th 94:3	38:24 39:1	123:10,21	139:2,10,1
93:16,18	1,712 205:14	242:4	131:22	2 290:17
104:14	1.3 160:5	12 11:5	133:8	202 9:14
108:13	1.4 165:25	62:15 63:8	138:10	20th 312:23
112:3,4	1/3 165:25	308:15	143:11,19	21 36:16
115:7	166:10	12:02 129:8	150:9	210 154:12
120:2	1:07 129:9	13 9:5 11:9	154:16	2-12 47:9
121:10,12,	10 25:3 52:3	51:25	155:6,11,1	215 9:15
24	53:6	67:1,3	7 156:12	23rd
122:9,18,1	56:6,11	288:4	157:20	281:16,18
9 125:2,23	57:20	1314-01	162:9,10	342:5
126:1	58:2,21	203:16	166:7	24 45:13
137:11	59:13 61:6	14 11:15	168:4	
147:3	86:8	87:23,25	172:3,5,11	
148:8	101:25	103:5	183:25	
150:9	102:16		187:15	
151:12	125:22		190:14	
154:5			193:8	
155:2,5			194:16	
156:11				

346				
307:21,22	3:32 200:18	169:11	205:12	219:22
24,000	30 49:17	48 126:8,23	212:16	220:21
151:16	136:1		242:6	309:3
244 9:17	185:14	<hr/> 5	60-metre	90s 70:6
25 44:13	214:4	5 14:4 52:5	208:24	9-35 46:24
255 9:19	30,000	60:4 62:1	211:1	97 297:4
259 9:20	150:15,19	111:15	242:19	98 73:12
265 9:22	302 336:16	125:19	61 242:6	155:6
268 9:23	30-metre	139:25	62 11:8	99.99th
272 12:9	136:1	141:1	65 113:20	122:6
28 144:2	213:6	181:15	242:6	9th 38:3,18
285 10:3	30th 281:17	200:13	67 11:14	273:2
295 10:4	293:12	205:1	<hr/> 7	281:14,18,
2D 20:24	342:6	207:24	7 246:22	23 342:4
2-	312 10:6	209:23	309:4	<hr/> A
dimensiona	315 287:20	212:4	7,000 151:8	a.m 13:1
1 19:9	318 10:7	219:25	7.3.1.1	86:10,11
22:2	32 104:9	228:11	161:3	abilities
	321 10:9	243:15,22	7/10 166:10	190:20
	329 10:10	253:16	7:16 343:21	ability
<hr/> 3	334 10:12	312:20	748 209:3,6	52:18
3 13:12	337 10:13	5.12 165:20	242:20	130:10
14:12 19:9	344 10:15	5:30 201:5	75th 151:13	131:4
21:22	35(1 285:25	243:17	283:6	134:13
54:10	36 286:16	5:52 284:21	284:4	147:5
122:17	39 11:4	5:56 284:22	77 176:11	214:22
140:1,25		50 95:22	<hr/> 8	215:8
164:2		98:8	8 35:13	267:5
168:16		204:25	307:20,24	322:16
173:17	<hr/> 4	225:23	8:46 13:1	332:13
180:14	4 14:3 19:17	238:20	80 159:21	able 52:21
185:13	125:20	258:4	800,000	56:21 59:3
187:15	238:18	287:10,24	151:14	107:4
211:19	247:8	500 212:23	821 216:7	187:5,14
215:21,22	312:19	243:5	87 11:19	214:17
219:24	4:30 243:17	52 175:22	8G 96:22	225:9
220:20	4:38 243:24	<hr/> 6		229:24
257:13	4:49 243:25	6 39:12		230:22,24
266:2	40 126:22	166:7		265:1
334:7	42 97:5	186:22		277:10
3.6 150:11	45 9:9	187:14		296:24
151:4,7,14	154:13	240:15	<hr/> 9	307:4
238:22		60 25:6	9 11:4 39:6	328:21
293:19		126:7,22	211:17	340:11,14,
3:13 200:17		159:21		16

347				
Aboriginal	295:2	107:15	287:6	acts 334:25
32:19	303:5	267:10	294:11	actual 164:4
47:20	accepting	276:11	335:3,4,18	191:12
163:16	62:24	277:3	336:1,5,7	actually
164:18	accepts	achieve	337:6,7,10	37:13
248:8	27:16	135:14	,16,17,18,	54:2,6
250:5,6,7	28:17	243:3	21,25	55:21
254:4	accommodatio	achieved	338:9	61:20 64:6
263:3,5	n 312:10	162:15	340:5,12,1	72:1 81:19
285:23	accomplished	325:19	acted 273:11	83:16 90:8
286:6,12	35:5 105:5	acid	action 11:13	96:6 97:3
291:24	accomplishes	194:12,13	31:22	118:21
295:17	43:11	acid-	33:15	121:14
298:2	According	generating	49:23,24	122:2
300:6	267:24	194:23	66:9	123:14
absolutely	accordingly	acidic	67:10,21	125:12
263:19	58:18,24	196:10	106:11,15	145:15
276:5	account	acknowledge	152:18	146:16
abundance	21:25	13:15	165:12	156:12
30:22	40:25	104:14	170:15,21	162:10
47:14	76:13	116:23	199:20	185:8
48:18	82:18	161:23	216:10	195:21
84:13	157:9	255:21	218:17	218:8
204:21	219:8	acknowledges	291:14	241:16,19
238:20	298:9,17	204:10	actions	264:12
253:10,11	299:8	268:11	33:17	299:12
293:22	314:9	across 40:8	45:25 46:3	301:17
AC35 288:21	accounted	70:7 75:10	50:1	312:23
293:11	90:16	93:2	161:21	323:22,25
294:5	99:11,16	159:19,20	211:21	324:3,23
academic	accounting	160:3	217:9	331:21
146:23	98:11	212:1	active	acute 30:9
accept 210:8	accounts	309:6	237:16	44:2,18
249:7	40:24 41:2	act 12:8	activities	52:24
acceptable	accumulate	42:20	29:7 31:11	59:13
27:9 214:6	164:7	169:21	32:5	143:7
230:18	accumulates	181:16	130:20	169:21
262:24	165:24	228:12	153:5	269:8,11
263:1,8	accumulating	250:14	157:9	273:9,15
270:16	211:21	269:8,10,2	206:6,25	326:1
282:4,10	accumulation	0,25 270:7	207:11	acutely 30:4
294:22	31:17,25	271:1	216:3	51:23 52:3
acceptance	323:23	272:11,22	310:10	53:7 57:20
27:1	accurate	273:7,9,10	336:3,12	58:3,9
181:17		278:25	activity	59:21
228:13		285:24	267:20	143:6,10
accepted		286:8,11	286:3	168:24
266:10				169:8
				ad 58:23

348				
Adamczewski	335:16	58:24	adjustments	332:12,14,
5:13	342:15	67:8,20	24:16	21 333:7
adaptive	additional	79:21	administered	advisable
24:16	20:3 21:25	114:17	286:17	181:24
29:16	54:9,15	127:8	administers	228:20
51:17,20	80:16	216:25	334:24	advised
52:2	103:10,22	234:8	admitted	201:4
57:3,15,23	106:2	252:5	256:11	advisement
58:17 59:9	118:3	266:3	adults 173:5	228:24
134:8	118:3	267:8	advance	Advisor
141:22	212:13	270:12	56:23	2:13,14,15
148:9,18,2	214:19	294:19,25	237:7	advisors
1,25	225:13	296:15	267:22	14:18
161:16	268:5,13	addresses	280:3	246:23
162:18	287:8	78:22	advancements	advocate
164:9,13	292:18	164:18	185:4	184:18
169:2	293:10,14,	322:25	advancing	AEMP 29:21
175:1,2,8	25 294:1	addressing	26:25	30:19,24
193:4	326:4	180:25	210:4	33:13,15,1
196:7	335:20	ade 262:8	advantage	9 34:11
216:11	340:13	adequate	240:7	35:3,8,22
217:2	Additionally	193:19	adverse	45:18
258:22	267:6	236:3	20:20	49:21
268:19	additive	267:7,19	33:17 46:4	104:11,12,
adaptively	11:10 66:7	294:21	50:2 59:2	15 106:3,5
59:4,19	67:4,18	296:13	99:17	107:1
141:5	229:21	adequately	104:23	108:14
add 50:7	address 17:1	127:8	146:1	148:10,25
120:24	23:17	205:25	150:7	149:14
124:2	41:10	259:2	170:25	163:10
151:18	51:16 93:6	261:23	182:17	164:24
169:19	101:13	262:8,11	183:2,5,8	167:12,18,
191:3	102:19	274:23	190:10	23,24
210:14	106:4	296:24	191:14	168:6,11
305:15	118:16	adjacent	193:15	169:1,19
326:15	148:10	48:22	196:23	170:16
333:9	164:21	193:18,25	197:3	172:4
added 106:3	241:22	adjourning	198:14	186:20,24
addi 335:20	242:18	343:21	199:4	187:7
addition	269:25	Adjun 3:9	254:3	267:2,3
16:20	280:15	adjust 50:11	296:24	AEMPs 44:7
33:14	293:8	134:9	adversed	aerial
68:11	294:10	268:8	254:3	325:16
81:11	296:11	276:12	adversely	aerodrome
112:8	305:25	adjustment	165:16	335:10
133:7	312:14	103:7	advice	336:15
168:15	addressed			
183:6	11:12 26:2			
326:1	29:17			

349				
Aeronautics	30:1,16	273:5	149:25	339:13,15
335:3	31:8	295:11,13,	152:11	allotted
af 221:23	36:12,16	17 297:11	153:18	14:10 51:6
323:13	38:5 39:10	318:15,17	261:18,21	allow 24:15
affect	41:23 42:3	329:7,9	262:18	54:14
76:19,24	43:6 45:13	337:3,5	264:25	58:17,23
77:3	46:21	338:2,7	alevins	61:2
130:2,9	49:3,25	agency's	167:4	104:21
198:2	50:20	31:15 47:8	199:19	132:7
215:2	160:17	agenda	Alex 7:18	200:1
313:19	161:1,10,1	200:21	75:24	252:6
314:4	3,23	ago 14:25	77:18	268:9
335:1	162:12,21	15:7	78:20,24	allowed
affected	163:5,25	agreeable	81:25	202:9
31:11	165:14	147:23	83:20,24	252:8
292:19	166:3,11,1	agreed 35:16	84:10	allowing
294:1,23	2 168:17	147:22	85:12 86:1	113:15
323:9	169:6	148:3	179:5	288:25
affects 50:2	170:6	189:14	221:9,10	allows 24:14
152:14	174:1,9	190:4	241:4	26:11 54:9
affluent	175:6	288:9	312:7	59:2 141:5
269:18	177:4,14	290:3	313:11	149:16
afternoon	178:14	309:23	320:13,22	allude 47:25
16:6 156:5	179:15,22,	agreeing	align 209:8	alluded
200:21	23 180:19	327:12	aligned	190:16
202:5,22	182:9	agreement	34:11,13	alongside
285:7	183:3	282:25	104:11	58:13
afterwards	184:4,9	321:15	alleviates	already 45:2
117:2	185:3,8	327:5	266:22	109:10
232:23	186:15,16	agreements	Alliance 8:4	110:24
310:22	187:12	248:7,24	113:1,3	137:13
317:12	189:12,20	249:7	114:5,21	164:23
against	190:12	Aguire 8:14	115:21	217:17
108:9	191:3,12	129:2	116:5,17	219:17
249:19	192:2,3,14	334:16	188:1,3	249:20
250:22	193:12	ahead 109:5	231:15,17	261:23
age 164:3	194:6,10	283:25	232:6,22	321:12
173:4	195:7	312:11	233:16	343:6
180:19	197:2,14	Aileen 4:3	234:10	alteration
agenc 174:8	198:25	airplane	252:18	286:10
318:17	199:2	201:5	260:15,17	alternative
agencies	215:18,20	airport	275:17,19	24:8 54:11
336:23	217:11	336:15	276:15,25	213:24
agency	218:23	al 213:19	277:17	alternativel
28:12,18	219:20	Alan 2:12	300:24	y 332:1
29:19	221:4		301:1	
	259:15,17		319:19,21	
	269:2,4,17		331:8,10	
	,21			
	271:4,22			

350				
alternatives	93:20	283:5	16:2 218:4	anyways
161:5	122:2			163:8
aluminum	123:9	annually	answers 60:1	187:2
326:20	140:17	253:5	125:2	317:25
am 39:23	145:14	answer 43:24	190:25	anywhere
44:4,15	146:17	55:17 59:8	201:16	257:1
166:19	153:2	65:22	202:12	apologies
217:18	184:25	66:16	269:5	163:4,5
252:19	185:25	71:10 84:7	antagonistic	219:18
285:9	186:18	85:14	11:10 66:8	apologize
327:12	267:12	106:21	67:6,19	146:21
amazing	274:18	112:19	anticipate	178:4
307:10	analyzed	118:25	278:23	217:12
AMEC 5:17	257:17	119:5,17	323:18	279:5
203:6	and/or	121:17	anticipated	apparent
amenable	292:22	126:18	12:6 28:23	22:15
96:17	Andrea 5:6	133:14	30:6	51:18
among 221:19	Andrew 4:21	138:4	162:13	208:19
amount 27:24	Andy 4:7	139:1	213:9	252:22
35:11	angle 316:11	140:23	272:9,19	256:23
210:10	animals	141:10	anticipates	apparently
232:19	248:18	145:8	290:7	69:13
264:3	250:11	146:16,25	anticipation	154:18
323:25	Anita 8:15	147:19	253:6	165:1
analog 123:2	188:18	149:19	anybody	appear 72:4
analogies	238:12	174:21	174:5	220:23
92:15	261:7	234:1	234:1	APPEARANCES
analogous	278:2	anymore	264:23	2:1 3:1
86:22	302:10	264:23	anyone 334:3	4:1 5:1
88:16,19	320:8	anyone's	anything	6:1 7:1
90:1,6	331:14	258:7	75:3,15	8:1
252:10	334:12,13	anyway	100:7	Appendix
256:12,24	337:9,13,1	102:19	102:19	96:22
273:13	337:9,13,1	187:16	187:16	applicability
analogs	4 340:7,8	256:20	256:20	335:17,25
124:4	Anne 2:15	281:20	281:20	Applicant
analogy	6:20	299:16	299:16	161:22
84:14	265:24	303:18	303:18	application
analyze	270:9,10	306:23	306:23	17:5
35:14	271:5	310:10	310:10	applied
analyses	272:4	313:4,12	313:4,12	57:16
35:14	273:12	answered	anyway	59:10
124:13	275:25	85:17	141:10	331:4
analysis	276:18	102:7	160:10	applies
20:24 30:9	277:4	196:12		
	283:22	answering		
	annual			
	276:22			

351				
340:12,17	27:14	294:12	17:5,13	230:1
apply 57:23	32:8,17	299:12	30:19	252:24
186:1	44:4,24	approximate	35:19	253:5
191:11	45:19	21:23	44:25	254:10
340:5	56:14	approximatel	265:23	257:22
appreciate	107:24	y 113:20	Archibald	258:17,21
84:13	109:4,12	150:15	3:25	264:12
127:10	110:2,12,1	151:8	arctic	266:16,20,
131:1	3,21	160:4	288:16	23 284:2,6
136:8	111:13	209:3	ARD 122:23	290:24
140:6	120:13	293:19	area	292:21
240:17	133:4	approximatio	28:15,21,2	293:21
243:11	141:8	n 19:10	5	296:7
262:6	149:7	April 19:12	29:1,3,8,1	306:25
277:13	152:17	aquatic	0,15	307:1,22,2
334:5	153:16	33:13	34:9,13,16	3 308:4
343:8,15	178:19,24	43:25	,23 36:24	323:13
appreciated	204:13	46:8,12	42:17,20,2	331:1
232:4	212:4	49:21	2 48:19	areas
312:10	214:5	94:25	49:1 54:19	31:10,24,2
appro 281:2	232:19	104:24	69:12,22	5
approach	281:2	105:8	71:2,3	69:3,7,9,1
12:2 17:9	282:11	107:20	77:17	0,11,15,16
105:19,23	287:12,25	108:24	84:25 89:6	,17 71:5
132:6	288:2	109:15	98:3,14,23	72:3 101:7
161:9	289:6,9	110:4	100:19	106:3
175:12	294:4,9,19	111:20	104:10,11,	114:3
201:22	301:16	116:25	13,21	125:10
204:15	appropriatel	126:16	105:17	153:14
226:14	y 93:6,9	127:12,13	109:19	178:23
272:7,14	235:17	128:4	113:6,12,1	194:22
278:18	236:19	129:23	7,19,21,23	240:5
290:23	approval	143:21	,25	264:9,18
298:8	25:13	152:15	114:1,22,2	291:22
301:16,24	162:8	167:12	4 115:19	305:16
305:19	182:24	169:6	119:24	307:11,16,
316:10	193:8	205:16	124:23	17
330:23	201:21	208:21	146:12	308:9,15,1
approached	287:5	236:3	157:17	7
175:10	337:24	266:17,24	178:19	aren't 73:6
approaches	approvals	267:14	179:13	77:15
226:6	248:15	268:17	180:7,22	82:1,11
approaching	334:25	290:12,18	193:12	89:3 107:7
53:6	approved	291:11	194:11	131:3
215:25	137:13,15	aquatics 9:7	195:14,19,	316:8,9
appropriate	222:16	14:13	21,25	argument
26:16	289:21	15:17	196:3,6	167:8
	290:2	16:3,11,17	204:17,25	201:19
	293:1		205:2,4,17	265:1
				279:24

352				
280:1	187:20	335:24	56:11 58:8	atmospheric
282:2	assessing	340:15	59:18	40:4
305:23	22:6	342:9,24	60:10	attached
342:5,6	204:13	assessments	68:14	167:5
arguments	assessment	28:3	70:2,22	attained
280:2,3	16:25	181:15	71:5 72:14	248:6
281:15,16	17:3,7,13	263:2	80:15	attempt
arise 190:3	18:24 26:5	assessor	89:1,24	89:18
Arktis 5:18	27:5,25	285:15	91:9 94:1	118:7
203:8	30:17	assign 19:14	96:4 98:19	131:2
arrangement	34:10,14,1	assigning	103:19	209:14
252:13	6	182:19	105:4	attempted
arrangements	35:2,12,15	assimilation	112:19	91:3
202:7	36:3 47:7	156:19	113:12	attention
282:3	52:25	247:4	117:19	49:20
304:6	53:19 56:1	assist	119:16	207:3
arrival	58:3	335:17	121:22	attractive
253:6	70:15,17	assists	134:2	322:13
arrived	99:10	18:21	144:15	augment
341:10	104:21	Associate	145:6	54:18
ascertain	105:9	104:18	149:6	August 6:6
324:22	107:17	114:14	151:1	13:17,19
aside 132:15	108:9,10	associated	154:11	161:25
aspect 212:5	112:6	19:7 21:3	157:6	authority
273:10	118:23	28:14	158:18	248:4,17
306:1	128:2,16	29:8,15	159:18	303:10
aspects	145:19	41:4 60:14	203:5	authorizatio
158:6	146:2	193:3	assume	n 144:8,15
215:24	173:7,21	203:16	197:25	294:11
217:3	175:24	204:20	307:9	298:8
222:8	176:1,4,8	206:25	assuming	303:11
assemblages	177:18	207:10	64:12	authorized
297:6	178:7,17	218:4	98:12	286:20
assess 80:19	179:16	224:14	175:1	availability
169:2	180:9,10	225:10	323:14	47:15
172:23	181:18	290:8	assumption	available
204:5	203:16,20,	336:16	140:8	19:2 25:10
274:23,24	21	associates	assumptions	37:10,14,1
298:12	204:4,12	3:14	19:4 20:7	5 38:18
301:22	206:7,19	15:1,2,3	assurances	54:22
assessed	212:21	16:16	100:8	62:10
17:8 18:8	220:18	17:20	237:7	87:14
19:15 23:8	221:2,5	26:22 31:8	assure 283:2	88:13
57:17 93:9	228:11,14	40:21 42:9	assured	136:14
152:25	262:25	48:12	174:5	139:2
	266:16	49:16 51:9	atmosphere	
	291:24	52:16	61:22	
	295:4			
	297:9			
	304:11			

353				
210:8	awesome	64:20	291:18	90:25
211:16	316:3	65:2,19,20	Barry 5:14	95:21 98:7
214:14	awful 190:21	66:1,13	51:8 61:19	125:10
274:22	axes 21:7,8	68:2 76:25	65:9,11	128:2
average	azteca 126:8	78:8 83:15	66:4 67:17	194:12,15
153:24		84:3,4	68:5,10	222:16
159:22		85:10	203:4	224:22
164:3	<hr/>	87:6,12	273:23	255:16
166:9	<hr/> B <hr/>	88:9 95:5	274:8	257:15
aviation	B0 288:21	100:14	base 156:16	Basin 33:2
336:13	293:12	101:2,22	based 12:4	basins
337:8	294:6	106:22,23	23:19	223:10
avoid 152:18	B1 293:12	115:15,25	24:11	basis 18:23
163:15	babies	116:1,10	53:17	24:10
173:23	248:24	127:20	64:13 80:8	153:1
186:22	baby 167:4	128:15	82:8	196:14
290:13	backfill	130:15	117:20	bathtub
301:9	77:5	131:21	121:13	40:12
311:9,12	backfilling	133:1	139:21	Bathurst
avoidance	77:9,17	138:9	145:8	178:18
289:16	back-flooded	139:8	148:19	183:6
293:3,6	119:24	140:21	150:12	bathymetry
avoided	back-	142:10	152:1	308:2,14
291:1	flooding	147:17	158:19	bay 69:21,22
294:8	104:1	154:18,23	173:21	Bear 83:3
avoiding	119:19	155:13	174:3	85:1
287:17	291:7	159:10,14	271:7	Beartooth
303:24	background	188:23	272:8,16	135:23
avoids 24:11	232:2	238:16	278:20	136:8,13,1
aware 89:25	backs 71:18	239:7,8	290:23	8,22 137:3
184:19,23	bad 194:25	261:12	309:24	139:1,4,10
185:4,8,20	bait 292:13	278:7	326:22	beating
,25 195:7	Band 274:11	279:1	342:22	137:21
218:8	bank 154:12	280:5,10,1	baseline	became 19:1
219:15	Bargery 2:21	1 282:7,18	44:12	Beck 4:12
249:25	14:23	302:15	70:2,3,17	become 51:18
297:2	15:10,11	320:12	107:18	97:15,22
308:11,13	36:4,5	331:19	108:14,19	161:15
away 74:12	37:8,23	333:12	111:4	208:7
80:6 87:9	38:10 41:6	339:24	113:7	252:22
165:12	43:3,18	barren 253:8	114:7	becomes
166:5,21	52:9	barrier	267:7,10,1	175:4
226:25	55:1,2	42:20	1,19	197:18,20
248:17	62:8	89:10	293:10	201:6
251:8,9	63:16,17	251:6	296:23	267:7
264:6		barriers	297:5,9	
278:10		32:12	basic 152:16	
		250:12	basically	
		289:11	40:11	

354				
bed 166:25	143:8	305:22	beverages	,14
bedrock	144:21	benefits	343:5	bird 269:22
21:21	147:18	52:17	beyond 57:2	270:3,7
beds 49:11	150:20	58:22	58:16	271:1
165:17,24	151:5	60:11 90:8	124:23	273:7,15
166:5	153:16	Berna 6:3	131:17	278:25
190:22	165:14	Bertha 1:14	165:15	birds 12:8
197:22	167:6	156:5,6,10	221:23	269:19,21
198:4	169:23	158:11	269:11	271:3
199:13,14	172:22	159:6	298:2	272:10,21
begin	173:6,21	308:23,24,	313:12	273:10,16
13:5,14	175:2	25	Biblical	278:24
17:4	178:6	309:15,16	41:14	bit 37:18,24
138:17	182:15	310:3,23,2	92:24	38:13 43:7
141:4	209:5	4	bigger	46:21
209:2,22	212:4	311:6,15,2	196:13	51:11 83:5
251:23	217:19	0	Bill 5:16	111:17
285:1	247:13	besides	7:11	120:24
beginning	251:12	152:16	160:15,16	133:17
209:22	256:2,14	288:12	176:5	138:14
219:25	260:23	best 32:15	178:13	140:4
behalf 65:12	261:23	55:13	182:8,9	147:2
66:5 67:18	273:2	101:11	183:3	150:8
179:22	297:8	120:12	189:12	156:6,22
250:24	303:17	161:2	191:2	159:25
251:3	309:20	190:22	199:24	194:7
252:12	322:19	227:16	Binion 4:18	199:25
255:14	believes	241:19,22	bioaccumulat	212:10
272:6	162:12	277:14	e 163:22	218:3
273:24	165:9	281:3	biological	231:25
274:9	174:9	282:12,13	65:14	232:2
285:19	191:24	289:3	163:17	237:21
behave	193:19	301:8	biologist	240:22
89:9,11	205:2	305:19	285:13	241:6,8
behaviour	255:24	310:15	biologists	242:4,7
34:24	303:7	316:14	165:23	283:18,24
276:8	Bell 2:18	better 73:13	biomass	313:12
behind 81:22	Ben 4:19	79:9	30:22	317:22
243:16	benchmark	133:17	171:15,21	322:14
believe	27:14	153:25	biopsies	326:6
26:1,14	266:9,12	210:2	184:7,17,2	328:20
73:5 90:18	283:1,18	212:18,21	0	Blake 4:15
94:17	beneficial	217:12	biopsy	blast
102:1	168:21	220:3	185:2,4,12	288:2,6
116:13	benefit	229:21		blasting
127:23	53:11 61:6	231:1		32:5,6
133:3,9	171:19	242:6,7		286:24
	198:18,19	Bevan 4:7		287:2,4,7,
	216:17			12,16

355				
303:20	156:10	20 310:4	boils 251:1	204:7,9,11
blockage	162:3,8,22	312:9	bomb 313:2	,13,16
191:5,9,17	,24 163:1	320:16,18,	bones 194:7	bounds 53:18
blowing 93:2	168:20	21 322:24	book 341:1	60:23
blown 217:19	176:11	324:16	booklet	box 141:20
blue 21:9	180:6,21	328:16	249:8	142:4
blunt 178:6	182:16,20,	332:5,6,10	borrow 84:19	boxes 18:9
board	24	,11,15,25	bottom 39:12	bracketed
1:3,11,12,	183:5,12,1	333:2,18,2	82:24 97:7	23:22
13,14,15	4 189:2,4	0,23	123:1,15,1	Bradley 6:18
11:4 13:11	190:7	334:19,23	9 165:8	300:21
14:14,17	191:19	336:23	301:13,18,	339:6
15:6 19:19	192:9	338:4	19 310:7	Braun-
20:6,12	193:8,11	340:2,4,21	322:2	Rodriguez
25:14	195:10	341:19	bottomless	(np 4:20
26:11,15	196:17	342:8,10,1	120:5	breach 77:6
27:2,18	197:7	2,15,17	301:7,13	126:5
35:9,25	198:9,11,1	343:11	321:20,22	breached
37:4,20	6,19	Boards	bought	42:13
39:6 41:19	200:8,11	236:18	343:14	76:11
45:5	201:1	237:22	boulders	77:2,4
63:7,12	202:5,15	Board's	322:10	119:10
64:2 67:15	207:2,7	41:12	bound 11:7	125:13
80:5	212:13	150:5	19:18 20:2	288:25
86:17,18	215:3	216:17	21:11,18,1	breaches
93:8	222:17,18	304:16	9,20	125:20,22
100:18,21	224:11	342:13,20	22:8,17,19	breaching
129:5,12,1	239:10,12	Bob 2:23	,23	76:15
5 131:1	240:9,13	bodied	23:5,15	break 86:8
132:14	241:3	184:5,6,7,	24:1 53:9	129:5
133:14	242:2	12,13	60:22	200:13
134:20	243:10	292:5	61:4,21	201:2
135:11,13	244:16,19	bodies 88:20	62:5,18	243:15,19,
136:8	252:3,6,14	89:13 98:4	63:20	20,22
137:10,15,	253:22,23	123:21	64:11,16	284:19
21	254:5	164:8	94:11	315:18
138:17,20,	261:14,17,	179:14	118:4	breakdown
25 139:18	21	258:18	boundaries	144:22
140:4	262:19,23,	291:9	34:13	breed 48:23
141:12	25 265:3,5	body 73:10	104:10	Brendan 2:18
142:25	271:25	89:17	203:20	Brett 2:8
144:1,9,17	278:16	97:16	204:4	5:22
,18 146:20	279:4,16,1	189:18	206:7,20	Brian 6:5
148:2,7	8 281:3,6	217:23	207:13	bridges
149:24	282:21,23	324:14	266:23	
150:1,6,20	283:17	329:2	boundary	
152:13	284:13	Boettger 3:6		
153:19,22	285:7,18			
155:24	303:2,4			
	304:4,10			
	306:15,18,			

356				
309:6	126:11	226:1	broad 176:10	163:3,4
brief 13:7	127:18	229:10	202:8	184:8,9
31:5 34:6	128:13,22	230:11	broader	185:7
36:8,19	130:13,23	232:11	73:17	186:14
37:6 38:8	131:19	233:1,20	broken	187:11,12
40:18	132:11,18,	237:11	250:24	190:11
42:25	24 133:24	238:8	brought	197:1,13
43:16	134:17	239:3	235:15	198:24,25
44:20 48:9	135:3,19	241:11	257:22	199:9
49:13	136:25	242:13	314:2	215:19
50:17	137:18	244:7	343:4	216:16
52:7,13	138:7,22	251:15,21	Bruno 5:10	217:10
56:8 58:5	139:6,15	254:16,20	bubbling	218:22,23
59:15 60:7	140:19	259:8	325:5	219:18
63:14	142:8,21	261:3	buffer 214:5	259:16
64:18	143:15,23	265:7,18	build 17:15	269:3,16
65:17,24	144:12	270:22	218:19	270:24
66:11	145:3	274:6	311:2	271:4,21
67:23	147:15	277:25	315:18	273:3,4,19
68:17	149:3	278:13	building	295:12
69:24	150:23	280:8	260:24	296:21
70:19	152:20	282:16	309:6,8	297:10
72:11	154:3,8,21	283:10	317:22	318:16
74:17	155:22	284:15	built	329:8
75:19	156:3	308:21	58:13,14	337:4
79:25	157:3	311:22	89:5	338:1,2
83:13 84:1	158:15	312:4	174:10,11,	
85:8,25	159:12	313:9	13,22	
87:4 88:23	161:2	320:4	310:18	
89:21 91:6	177:20	334:9,22	bullet 36:22	
93:23 95:3	178:1,11	340:23	45:13	
96:1 98:16	179:16,19	341:5	49:21	
100:12	182:3	briefly	257:23	
101:20	186:12	266:6	burbot 164:7	
103:16	187:9	285:16	187:18	
105:1	189:10	335:12	288:17	
106:7,18	192:11	brilliantly	Byers 7:15	
107:11	194:3	152:12	39:8,10	
108:21	196:25	bring 71:23	41:22	
109:22	198:6,22	72:8	42:23	
111:8	199:7	240:18	43:5,22	
112:16	202:1	271:13	45:7,12	
113:9	203:18	299:22	46:19,20	
114:11	216:14,20	300:14	49:2,3	
115:13,23	217:25	bringing	50:19	
116:8	219:11	72:7	160:24	
117:16	220:13	brings 44:2		
119:13	222:1	73:25		
120:7	223:24	78:18		
121:19	224:6			
125:15	225:1			

357				
34:8 48:11	247:13	336:2,5,9,	80:10	8 22:18,24
49:15,16	260:7,9,11	11,14,21	82:22,23	23:6 24:11
70:1,21,22	261:6,8	337:14	caps 103:21	41:14,18
71:4 72:13	265:15,20,	339:5,7,9,	capture	53:1,8
104:17	22	11,21	34:17,18	57:19,24
105:3,4	266:1,25	340:9,10	246:1	58:17
106:9	267:4,18	Canada's	captured	59:9,12
108:2	268:4,13	266:22	292:20	60:21 61:4
112:18	269:9,15	334:14,23	323:3	63:20
113:11	270:10	336:20	Cardinal 4:4	83:2,21,22
114:13	271:2,6	Canadian	care 304:14	85:16
144:14	272:5,13	165:4	career-	94:10
150:25	273:13,25	287:1	limiting	96:24
151:11	274:4,17,1	cap 24:22	223:4	117:13
153:2	8,22	25:5 78:5	caribou	118:5,8
154:5,10	275:3,13	103:8,13,1	74:5,12,13	120:10
155:1,14	276:1,19	4,23	,15 75:13	122:4
159:17	277:5	131:17	114:25	142:3
camels	278:1,3,10	132:5,16	176:19	149:9,21
317:24	,18	133:4,16,2	178:18	163:21
camp 253:6	279:3,11	1 134:9,11	227:14	175:3,11
camped	281:20,22	136:1	250:14	195:20
114:24	282:24	208:24	253:7	204:17
Canada	283:12,15,	209:1,24	256:6	235:8,9,11
6:10,15	23 284:25	210:21	341:14,17	242:21
8:14 9:22	285:4,20	211:2,4	Carlo 19:9	270:15
10:12 12:2	286:18	212:16	20:24,25	281:12
24:19	287:15,22	213:6,10,1	22:2 76:5	313:20
27:12 34:8	288:11	3,17,20	312:25	314:5
54:5 75:10	289:2,8,13	214:25	Carpenter	cases 20:7
103:2,4	,22	224:11	4:22	126:21
104:7,20	290:6,10	242:19	carried	301:15
106:25	291:2,13	268:9,16	22:9,24	catastrophic
108:12	292:6,9,17	316:13	53:19	83:8 84:16
109:17	293:5,15,2	capable	carry 63:24	144:22
111:3,23	4	170:24	65:5 286:2	145:11,12
112:1,3,24	294:3,14,2	capacities	carrying	146:21
129:1,3	2,25	192:20	84:14	catch 201:5
164:8	300:20,22	220:5	CARs 336:16	catchment
177:11	301:6	capacity	Carthew 2:6	146:11
181:12	302:9,11	54:6,12,15	case 18:24	caterers
183:19,21,	319:10,12,	,17,18,22	19:5,18,21	343:4
23,25	17 320:7,9	58:11	,24	Catherine
185:22	326:17	84:13	20:2,3,5	2:11 4:20
188:17	330:7,9,11	capped	21:11,12,1	Catholique
228:8,9	,13	123:15,20		6:3,4
231:7,9,11	331:13,15	327:7		caught
,13	334:1,11,1	cappuccino		283:23
238:11,13	7,20,24			
	335:7,15,1			
	6,23			

358				
292:5	certainly	59:6,24	253:22	159:8
330:24	37:25	61:18	259:17,21	160:6
cause 45:24	62:11	62:23 63:7	265:4	173:11
213:22	72:17 99:8	65:8 68:20	268:22	175:17
238:1	124:8,19	84:3 85:23	269:4	179:3,8
254:3	191:16	87:18	270:10	181:6
270:6	296:1,15	113:3	271:17	182:5
	298:7,16	116:22	280:6	183:18,22
caused	299:7,18	118:14	281:5,12	187:25
170:11,12	300:13	154:6,23	282:4,8	188:4,8,12
171:8	304:1,24	160:16	285:7	,16,21
172:12	308:18	173:15	297:15	189:1
234:23	331:4	174:24	302:24	200:10,20
causing	332:13	175:14	306:14	202:17
146:15	certainty	177:23	308:25	215:17
181:21	124:9	178:4	312:9	219:16
caveat 87:15	155:20	179:1	318:21	221:7,12
CCME 177:10	Certificate	181:8	321:3	224:1
cease 210:24	10:15	182:9,14	328:15	227:6
C-E-dash-Q-U-A-L	certificatio	183:17	329:14	228:23
219:6	n 335:11	201:1,11,2	334:13	231:6,10,1
cede 248:7	Certified	0	338:14	4
ceded 249:11	344:1	202:3,14,2	340:19	234:11,15
celebrate	certify	3 203:18	Chairperson	238:5,10,1
253:10	336:15	206:18	1:10	4 239:9
Cell 137:12	cetera	207:15	13:3,9	240:12,24
centimetres	227:15	211:25	14:1,21	243:13
159:21	Chaffee 2:25	212:25	15:5 18:10	244:1,10
centuries	chain 163:14	215:13,20	36:10	251:10,17,
95:23	171:17,19	216:23	38:21 43:1	23
258:4	173:3	218:2	45:10	254:12,18,
Century	184:13	219:14	50:22	22 255:4,8
312:23	chair 13:10	220:16	62:21	259:14,18,
CE-QUAL 96:8	14:24	222:4	63:24 65:5	23
219:5	15:11	224:9	67:25	260:2,6,10
certain	16:14	226:4	68:8,22	,14,18,23
42:13	17:20 24:5	227:8,9,22	86:4,13	261:5,10,1
73:12,13	26:22 31:7	228:15	87:16	6
92:19	33:1 35:10	229:13	102:22	265:5,9,14
172:16	36:6 38:23	230:2,14	103:1	269:1
174:4	39:9 43:4	231:5,23	106:20	271:15
264:2	48:11	232:14	111:25	272:25
270:6	49:3,15	233:4,23	112:25	273:21
323:19	50:21,25	235:2	116:19	274:10,14
	52:10,15	236:7	120:21	275:8,12,1
	55:2,16	237:14	125:4	6
	57:9	238:3	127:3	277:18,22
		239:6,23	128:24	278:1,5
		240:15	129:4,11	282:20
		243:12	153:19	284:12,17,
		252:3,16	155:24	24 295:10

359				
297:12,17,	225:22	160:1	256:24	182:23
21 298:21	226:17	288:25	chops 318:8	212:11
300:19,23	229:7	289:25	Chris 2:7	240:16
301:2	234:19	characterist	129:2	242:3,5
302:8,13,2	248:17	ics 73:10	334:16	243:10
5 306:17	258:5	characteriza	Christopher	261:19
308:23	263:1,9	tion	8:14 129:2	262:6
311:24	273:25	121:11	chron 30:9	272:1
318:14,18,	287:11	180:12	chronic 30:9	336:10
24	327:10	characterize	119:8	clarificatio
319:4,9,13	337:17	d 206:1	326:2	ns 117:2
,18,22	changed 23:2	charge	Chuck 2:2	clarificatio
320:1,6,10	changes 28:4	228:6,17	circumferenc	n's 261:20
,15,20,23	33:16 35:6	250:14	e 253:17	clarified
326:11	45:15,20	charges	circumstance	266:19
328:2	46:1,2	250:13	41:16	clarify 48:6
329:6,11,1	47:10 50:1	Charles 3:5	circumstance	64:2 72:14
6,20	87:1 105:7	charts 20:23	s 93:7	89:4 91:9
330:1,6,10	141:22	21:4	cisco 287:19	121:23
331:7,12,1	157:10	chase 74:11	cited 86:22	132:21
7	167:25	check 141:20	256:12	138:25
333:10,17,	170:11,12,	142:4	286:24	139:9
22	16,22,23	chemical	civilians	151:1
337:2,11	171:9,21	30:8	249:1	152:23
338:11,16,	172:24	chemistry	cladocera	162:10
20,25	184:21	81:4 99:9	44:5	184:4
339:4,8,12	229:7	118:22	172:10	197:3
,16,20	230:23	chemocline	cladoceran	262:2
340:1,20,2	234:23	324:23	44:17	276:16,20
5 341:7	258:8	325:1	cladocerans	341:12
chance 14:11	274:2	Chief 7:17	169:8,9	clarity
93:17,18	291:16	248:15	claim 249:10	64:22
121:11,12	322:22	children	claims 249:9	283:2,19
122:1	337:19,20	249:11	Clar 85:1	Clark 5:8
155:6	changing	250:20	clarificatio	classes
283:20	131:3	Chipewyan	n 57:12,22	173:4
333:13	282:3	14:4	63:10	Claudine
Chang 3:19	channel	chloride	111:14	2:22 44:22
change 30:17	14:3,4	156:24	112:4	46:6 74:19
45:22,24	32:16,17,2	159:1	114:6	75:21
48:13 57:2	0,23 33:2	205:13	120:16	107:13
58:20	144:4	cho 329:3,6	126:1,3	108:23
98:11	159:20	choices	144:19	109:24
114:9	160:2			111:10
130:8,9,20	288:10,23,			120:9
157:13	24 289:12			126:13
158:3	322:10,12,			135:5,21
171:5,23	17			136:5
186:3,9	channels			
201:6				

360				
137:2,16	271:24	42:1 50:9	240:3	330:23
139:10	278:15	64:16	242:23	collection
143:17	281:13	76:10	258:3,24	106:13
Claudine's	303:3	98:25 99:3	263:11	108:18
138:4	306:14,15	100:16,20	267:24	111:5
Claw 83:3	320:17	101:5	268:2,6,12,15	137:7
	333:19	113:5,22	288:22,24	292:23
clean	climate	114:3,8	289:23	collective
102:14,15	77:12	119:11	291:7	230:9
258:12	98:11	125:8	324:11,12	collectively
cleaned	225:22	129:17,20,21	341:24	229:7
200:4	226:17	130:3,10,16,18	342:7	colonization
clean-up	258:5	131:2,3,5,10,13,16,24	Cluff 5:9	247:5
230:4	climatic	133:8,9	co-disposal	colourful
clear 67:25	226:18	134:13,20,24	194:12	74:11
90:2,25	close 31:10	135:9,17	collaborative 267:21	combination
92:6 93:14	98:4 99:24	136:4,20	collapse	comes 122:24
94:2	224:1	138:13	82:18 83:9	149:16
115:16	258:18	147:6	85:13	197:15
140:24	307:5	157:22	collapsed	198:9
146:15	327:24	180:18	83:6	281:20
166:10,12	closed 88:17	204:1	colleague	322:8
170:23	91:20	206:10,13,17,25	163:2	323:2
191:15	137:4	207:9	191:17	comfort
201:24	139:4	209:8,11,15,20	215:22	100:24
206:18	221:21	211:6,13	colleague's	comfortable
212:1	244:20	212:15,22	194:8	124:17
214:3	256:19	214:2,6,9,10,12,17,22	collect	153:6
299:24	321:24	215:9	24:13 35:3	190:5
304:6	343:19	222:9,10,11,15,23	134:4	242:10
328:13	closer 302:5	226:7,8,9,10,11,15,19,25 227:1	267:7	coming 64:12
332:4	closes	230:8,9	collected	130:21
343:10	139:10	231:1,19,20 232:8,18	70:9 107:7	195:1,22
clearly	closest	233:7	109:10	212:1
178:16	287:19	234:21,25	136:3	234:1
Cliff 63:11	closing	235:5,6,10,12,23	168:25	244:14
Cliffe 200:7	263:7	236:11,12	187:6	250:17
271:24	265:1	239:18	267:11,19	262:20
278:15	271:13		268:21	334:2
303:3	281:15,16		331:5	commencement
320:17	341:9,11		collecting	52:20
333:19	342:5,6		75:5 108:8	56:22
Cliffe-Phillips	closure 18:5		111:4	commencing
2:3	23:19		135:24	13:1
14:16,17	24:20,23,24 25:12		139:22	commend
63:9 66:25	26:13 28:9			
67:1 200:7				

361				
314:10	101:4	170:17	299:17	148:5
316:1	109:11	communities	companies	comparing
comment 86:5	119:22	15:19	101:12	114:7
121:16	137:24	17:15	249:20	317:10
122:25	158:7	33:18 34:1	Company	comparison
124:3	162:22	45:5 46:16	37:21	21:15
174:15	215:11	47:20 50:4	39:13	22:17
176:14	216:2	110:6	44:15	63:18
181:19	236:8,21	116:14	45:24	123:8,24
244:2	267:18	150:18	46:22 48:5	148:20
251:11	commitments	152:6	57:22 59:3	comparisons
252:1,23	35:17	153:15	99:6	127:15
280:14	138:11	163:16	101:11,12	168:15
302:23	237:25	171:1,8	161:4,8,17	compendium
326:16,25	268:14	172:6,12	165:9	96:23
330:14	342:1	187:18	167:17,21	compensary
Commentary	commits	247:5	168:23	341:15
9:17 244:9	29:6,22	250:3	169:5	complete
commented	30:3	292:8,19,2	170:2,14,2	107:5,22
183:9	32:6,13	2	4	296:23
commenting	33:3,10,24	294:2,17,2	180:1,8,9	331:2
331:22	committed	3 295:17	186:21	335:23
comments	25:20 27:7	298:3	194:24	342:17
120:25	28:8	299:1,4,8,	195:14	completed
176:1	32:17,21	22,25	219:2	17:1
227:9	35:20 44:3	300:12	220:1,19	18:16,25
243:17,20	58:8 109:5	302:5,22	226:6	19:6 20:6
244:4,11,1	110:24	community	274:19	23:20 25:7
9 251:19	132:6	44:10,14	276:2,13,2	40:22 45:4
259:4	143:7	45:16,22,2	2 277:6,14	70:6 80:18
271:14	144:5	4 46:2,4	298:25	108:10
285:17	173:1	98:5	309:23	110:25
303:1	230:17	170:12,17,	328:16	118:10
321:10	235:18	22	Company's	180:16
326:15	247:12,14	171:3,19,2	47:8	191:21
327:22	310:1	2,24	180:25	325:23
commercial	322:19	172:24	194:11	completely
285:22	committee	223:15	199:18	257:25
286:5,12	259:3	255:19	comparable	completion
commit 66:21	committing	256:8	170:5	35:13
111:4,11	119:8	263:14,16	compare	complex
137:8	126:4,7	264:5,7,9,	63:17 95:6	66:24
142:16	common 92:18	21,24	108:9	142:15
236:2	253:10	292:14	330:24	174:3
commitment	315:11	300:13	compared	complexities
26:25 30:4	commun	338:7	47:1 95:8	78:18
57:6	292:14	342:25	113:7	
61:8,15	communily	community- based	123:5	
			127:11	

362				
complexity	312:25	79:20 98:4	213:11	325:7
66:14	con 51:8	99:23	224:16	327:15
complicated	134:22	100:3	225:18	conditions
189:19	292:6	167:10	228:5	23:2,23
comply 336:7	294:2	179:24	248:1	53:6,10,18
337:24	325:23	184:2	258:15	56:21 57:2
component	327:22	191:16	263:18	58:12,15
17:6 23:16	concentratio	194:9	275:4	59:20
26:9 32:8	n 23:9,10	196:21	321:14	60:20,24
components	172:13,14	204:15,19	324:6,9,10	61:2 81:15
15:15	205:14	207:17	328:12	117:5,8,14
16:17 17:8	210:18,20	208:10	332:25	121:8
34:24	243:4	227:18	336:2,11	134:7,14
35:21	266:9	230:6	conclude	161:14
111:21	concentratio	237:22	259:5	167:13,22
158:2	ns 19:23	238:2	286:22	170:3,4,5
176:3	20:2	255:19	304:17	171:4
178:16	22:13,16	257:22	CONCLUDED	209:7,15
180:14	23:3 24:25	266:22	245:23	211:24
203:13	37:1 53:3	267:23	concludes	216:2
215:3	81:20	268:2	36:6 127:1	315:13
267:2,8	96:20	281:8	215:14	322:2,4,14
335:7	103:25	327:10,19	259:11	324:5,7,10
composed	104:3	332:17	273:20	,20
205:10	123:4	concerned	327:22	325:12,14
composition	141:14	47:21	conclusion	331:25
30:21	205:8,16	76:23	99:17	conduct
158:18	209:2,12	131:9	124:16	105:14
comprehensiv	212:23	161:13	199:23	215:4
e 17:24	concept	163:18	336:19	292:18
19:13	91:19	169:6	conclusions	293:25
20:13	conceptual	179:13	20:14 26:7	294:1
23:19	33:23	205:15,25	65:13	conducted
27:23 28:9	35:22 45:3	213:21	conclusively	25:9 35:11
compri	107:22,24	221:17	290:22	168:13
213:14	108:24	258:11	concomitant	216:3
comprise	145:7	267:1	274:2	conducting
158:25	146:16	270:2	concurrent	105:14
comprised	174:12	concerning	24:12	conductivity
213:14	226:9	228:16	concurr	50:15
computational	290:18	concerns	290:10	conduit 97:4
l 76:3	293:2	17:2 23:17	292:6	confidence
computational	299:1	50:12	condition	35:14
lly 96:16	303:25	52:24	27:16	56:24
computer	concern	53:22	52:23	60:19,23
	19:20	164:18,21	121:2,7,10	71:24 72:8
	54:24 59:4	178:23	,14 220:6	90:20 93:8
	75:13 77:1	196:15,18		98:22
		204:4		
		211:23		

363				
118:9	48:21	181:24	290:24	206:3,24
131:4,11,2	88:19	183:1	292:4	207:9
3,25 132:2	89:16 92:7	214:12	300:16	216:1,6,7,
135:13	155:7	218:15	327:14	11 217:3,5
223:21	256:20,21	228:19	342:13	218:7,10
233:10		237:23		267:20,22
267:4	connecting	240:19	considering	301:8,12
277:11	290:8	253:2	81:6 112:8	323:14
	connection	288:15	205:3	
confident	71:21	301:7	234:24	consul 185:9
22:3 23:22	73:7,8,9	328:4	consistency	consult
99:15	74:5	342:10,15	48:14	336:6
100:2	207:20		consistent	consultant
101:10,11	270:13	considerably	23:9 30:23	65:9 185:9
130:11	connectivity	22:16	70:7	consultants
131:12	34:25	consideratio	105:23	3:13 19:11
161:9	76:20	n 29:20	159:3	26:12 51:8
277:2	313:14	47:22 51:5	209:6	80:12
295:3		54:19 66:6		124:12
Confir	consequence	110:11,14	consistently	consultation
193:16	237:2	114:23	284:3	181:24
confirm	consequences	117:6	constant	182:12
32:23	237:8	155:16	90:12	228:19
112:6,12	conservation	289:18	constituents	291:15
117:6	250:4	321:22	24:25	294:1
119:7	conservatism	322:25	158:24	298:2,8
120:20	149:12,20	335:5	159:2	
128:10		342:20	205:11	consultation
131:12	conservative	consideratio	constitute	s 292:18
138:1	17:9	ns 191:10	287:5	consulting
143:9	19:6,21,24	considered	constraint	3:22 5:14
270:18	21:12,18	22:6 24:2	181:20	15:4
304:12	22:18	34:23	construct	185:10
confirmation	24:11	47:12	322:8	300:10
193:17	53:1,2,7	53:17 70:3	constructed	consumers
270:20	57:19,24	78:17	217:21	164:14,15
271:12	58:17	80:24	311:18	contact
confirmed	59:9,12	106:14	323:16	336:8
20:14	60:21	112:7,13		containment
271:18	63:20	117:22	construction	137:13
confusing	92:23,24	119:1	28:25	172:8
80:13	94:10	137:12	29:1,2,7	216:6
confusion	148:15	146:2	99:2	
43:7 48:16	175:3,11	149:18	108:19	contaminant
198:9	consider	158:7	111:5	163:12,19
connect 89:8	53:21	168:8,19	189:14	262:8
135:6	65:14	218:20	190:1	contaminants
connected	108:7	235:16	192:24	11:11
	117:13	236:18	205:20,21	65:15 66:8
	152:17	266:7		

364				
67:7,19	103:8	157:10	306:13	333:18,21
163:18	131:16	229:7	344:1	340:2,4
164:19	136:21	contribution	correctly	counsellor
185:25	137:11	s 36:2	44:6	328:3
186:10	193:1	control	144:25	count 249:3
209:12	213:24	37:25	correspond	323:9
213:19	268:5,14,2	38:13	202:6	counted
contaminate	0	50:10	205:1	323:7
184:3	314:16,17	77:9,14	correspondin	330:21
contaminated	317:1	289:19	g 235:5	counterintui
28:20	327:14	controller	corresponds	tive 79:1
223:17	contingent	49:17	205:13	counts
233:25	161:5	controlling	corridor	29:20,23
262:13	continually	310:18	32:25	167:11,16,
contaminates	267:13	Convention	Council 8:9	18
184:14	continue	12:8	128:25	168:7,11,1
cont'd 3:1	17:14 27:7	269:19,25	188:13	6
4:1 5:1	32:18	270:7	238:6	couple 15:16
6:1 7:1	33:18,25	271:1	252:7	59:25 69:1
8:1 10:1	102:4	272:10,22	261:1	113:4
contention	110:22	273:7	277:23	121:23
166:4	124:19	278:25	302:9	136:12
CONTENTS 9:1	167:19,22	conventional	320:2	144:1
10:1	208:2	321:24	331:13	168:22
context 18:6	237:19	convince	339:21	179:25
22:9	243:21	257:18	counsel 2:16	181:9
80:12,16	249:16	cooperation	3:12	228:22
189:18	293:5,15	336:22	5:24,25	239:12
197:11	294:2,15	copper 223:9	38:21	256:11
299:3	continued	248:20	62:21	298:24
304:11	26:6 177:5	326:21	87:16	301:5
contingencie	295:15	copy 85:15	129:5,13	303:16
s 51:25	336:22	Corey 3:10	189:2	321:23
53:16,20	continuing	corollary	200:9,22,2	324:18
54:6 56:13	39:8	187:13	3 203:10	327:24
78:15	143:20	273:4	239:10	328:5
132:4,15	contract	Corporation	240:10	coupled
133:10	251:2	203:17	251:24	76:17
162:5,18	contracts	correct	252:3,17	course 15:18
174:20	250:23,25	65:22	261:17	16:3 54:7
192:20	251:2	143:18	271:15	76:10
193:5	318:8	163:25	279:18	77:22 79:5
208:20	contradicted	225:4	281:6	82:19,22
contingency	47:8	269:15	282:21	120:4
24:23 54:8	contrast	271:22	303:2	159:21
55:19,21	35:2		304:4	198:12
56:3,5,15	contribute		306:16	263:19
			320:16,19	264:17

365				
265:1	235:5,11	321:20,25	111:19	184:15
279:25	236:12	322:3	135:6,22	185:21,22
314:23	criterion	culverts	136:9	187:21
342:12,23	176:19	120:5,10,1	159:4	231:12
courses	Croft 5:10	1 301:7,17	168:16	260:12
309:12	crossing	311:8,9	186:20	275:14
cover 208:25	74:15	321:22	187:6	285:5,9
214:4	189:22	cumu 157:7	190:14	295:23
217:2	301:8	cumulative	223:6	297:1
243:1	309:14	21:5,7,14,	225:19	298:6
covered	310:18,22	16 34:19	242:24	299:5
257:25	311:5	147:2,8	267:1	300:1
313:22	crossings	157:8,20	274:22	301:10
create 40:14	32:11	158:2,9	currents	303:15
42:5 56:5	120:4	183:6,8	31:22	304:21,22
83:22	309:4,12	204:11	40:24	306:12
146:13	310:14	229:18,19,	42:17	307:12
166:1,14	311:2	22	113:16	308:12
created	crowd 203:10	cups 264:19	166:16,20	309:10,19
39:19 40:3	crucial	cur 113:16	curtail	310:12,13
41:24	191:7	Curran 1:15	211:16	311:3,7,17
205:21	267:11	153:21,22	curtailing	330:12
creating	crucially	155:4	220:20	339:10
90:13	191:4	current 44:8	curtain	dam 125:12
171:4	cubed 97:5	95:7 107:1	217:19	D'Amours
creation	cubic 54:10	129:19,20	218:9	319:15,16
11:18	cultural	137:3	323:13,20,	D'Amours-
87:21 88:4	115:6	164:24	25 324:2	Gauthier
184:22	247:12,14	167:12,23,	curtains	6:10
Creator	250:2,9,10	24 172:4	217:21	285:13
248:18,19	305:16	179:17,24	323:15,21	dangerous
credible	306:1	180:7	curves 21:14	335:4,10
277:7	culturally	186:24	cushions	336:4,6,9
credit 84:12	114:23	187:7	343:15	daphnia
creek 193:18	153:14	190:19	cut 76:23	44:6,9,17
196:5	culture	195:7	cutting	143:8
crews 72:24	245:20	196:6	313:7	169:17
criteria	cultures	199:21	cycles	DAR 16:25
54:22	253:9	206:13	226:18	17:23,24
119:25	culvert	209:8	<hr/>	18:17 19:2
176:7	120:12	211:6	D	20:14
214:9	301:13,18,	214:10,11,	D'Aguiar	23:21 26:7
222:13,15,	20	17	6:12	27:22 28:1
22,25	311:12,16,	242:18,20	Dahl	31:14
232:18	19	288:22	112:2,23	34:10
233:7		317:11	183:24	46:24
		currently		48:14
		48:2 109:6		51:19
				52:25

366				
53:24	267:16	130:25	176:13	333:1,5
57:16,18	dates 202:12	132:13,20,	201:18	decisions
58:3 81:12	342:3	21 133:13	280:25	212:9
96:5,22	Davidson	134:19	307:5	236:5,19
112:20	4:17	135:10	332:17	237:24
117:20		136:7	dealing	281:4
118:24	day 13:12,22	140:7,14	150:3	decline
145:15	14:12	141:14	178:20,22	172:11
148:15	18:22 29:5	142:1,6	227:11	declined
165:5	76:15 97:5	145:20	deals 247:23	172:10
166:6,13	126:7,8,23	147:12	dealt 217:17	declines
167:14	127:24	156:8,13,1	258:23	172:5
168:6	161:2	8	259:2	declining
171:2	165:22	157:11,13,	261:22	44:9
187:16	190:17	17,18,20,2	262:8,10	decrease
204:7	239:16,19	3 158:3,10	Dean 5:9	208:8
207:21	249:3	159:5	death 286:9	deemed 331:2
208:12	324:6	162:20	303:20	deep 73:7,8
210:1	328:20	177:7	305:3	253:16
238:22	334:5	187:3	Deault 6:9	296:6
242:21	339:22	189:3	debate	307:1,10,1
dashed 23:7	days 15:17	190:6	146:23	6,17,18
data 24:14	126:22	191:18	Deborah 3:25	308:1,3,17
25:2,10	192:22	193:10	December	310:6
35:3	221:20	204:10	109:9	deeper
70:2,8	227:12	205:4	decide 45:24	103:23
75:5	334:7	207:20	243:15	211:3
108:19	DD 127:8	209:10	decided 55:8	242:25
111:4,6	DDEC 43:24	211:12	decimate	243:2
122:7	127:8,10	229:8	186:3	307:23
134:3,10	165:14	230:23	decimetre	308:15
136:2,13,1	177:14	231:2	165:21,22,	defer 283:13
7 137:4,7	236:3	234:19	25	deficit
139:21	254:9	238:24	decision	123:8,23
141:4,19	de 2:4	239:11	25:16	define
147:25	18:2,8	240:9	58:20	133:16
149:16	20:18,21	252:25	119:20	235:10
168:25	27:6 28:6	266:20	150:5	defined
174:4	34:21	268:3	182:18	233:7
267:7,11	47:1,5,23	290:22	183:10	285:24
276:10	48:19,25	deadline	212:5	286:9
292:23	64:1,25	273:1,2	255:8	defines
293:9	67:14 69:3	deadlines	280:16	330:22
296:23	71:7,9,14,	282:3	282:14	definitely
297:5,9	22 72:5,18	deal 18:22	324:17	174:10
309:20,22	97:4 99:12	56:25		
331:4	112:9	60:14		
date 25:8	118:19,23	61:14		
111:1	129:14	132:6		
118:10		160:22		

367				
184:11	78:25	329:17,19,	332:18	31:12
199:4	84:11	21,23	339:18	165:7,11,2
216:24	86:2,3,14,	331:23	d'Entremont	0
327:10,19	16 88:15	333:9	7:21	196:19,22
343:12	89:15	338:17,19,	116:22	197:8,23
definition	90:24	21,23	119:4	214:12
48:24	91:18	Deneron 1:10	120:2,15	254:2
definitions	93:12	13:10	127:1	depositional
286:11	94:21	Denholm 3:22	188:7	31:24
degradation	95:13,17	15:4	260:21	depth 23:4
83:5	98:1 99:22	Deni 120:23	277:21	24:22
171:10	101:9	Deninu 25:23	301:4	25:5,6
degrade	102:10	30:1	302:2	97:17,21
209:2	120:19	116:19	319:25	103:8
degraded	124:6	120:23	321:3	134:11
83:4	144:20	125:7	332:19	153:24
degrading	179:4,6,9,	188:4	339:19	155:1
215:1	11 181:4	234:11	Department	156:1
degree	221:8,10,1	260:18,21	151:21	159:9,23
210:14	3,15	277:18	202:25	160:3
delay 192:14	223:15	301:2	203:14	166:14
delayed	224:21	319:22	285:3,11,1	167:7
24:10 61:3	225:16	320:23	4	208:6
deleteriousness	227:4	326:9	departure	209:24
273:15	244:24	328:2	317:6	212:16
deliberately	245:8,20	329:23	depend 191:3	243:6
123:19	246:2,8,9,	339:16	dependent	307:13
deliberation	19,20	Dennis 3:19	38:19	309:18
s 342:14	247:1,3,19	densities	79:6,9	depth-
demonstrated	248:16,20,	146:14	depending	limiting
24:21	22 249:19	density 80:9	77:10	291:4
demonstrates	250:8,19,2	90:14	159:24	depths 80:25
136:18	0 253:4	123:6	depends 95:1	154:19
Dene 6:2	254:24	151:3	137:6	159:22
13:16	255:2,14,2	d'entremont	154:14	deputy 328:3
25:23	3 257:1	116:21	191:4	Der 5:17
28:12,13,1	259:24	119:3	deposit	6:24 203:6
8 68:23,25	260:1	120:1,14	286:18	des 309:24
69:2,6	262:5,15	126:25	deposited	describe
70:5,13,23	263:13	188:6	166:4	15:24
71:1,17	274:11,13,	234:13,14	206:8	121:2
73:20	17 275:1,6	260:20	213:5	145:1
75:25	297:18,20,	277:20	214:18	161:4
76:22	22,24	301:4	323:24	described
77:19	298:19	302:1	deposition	29:4 70:3
	312:1,6,8	319:24	25:22	92:24
	314:15	321:2	28:21	152:14
	316:5	327:21		
	318:25			
	325:15			
	328:22			

368				
206:1	226:15,19	detected	110:20	27:8 32:9
207:21	desire 307:8	105:22	170:16,25	33:20
234:18		detection	176:23	34:1,3
236:9	desktop	193:3	219:2	44:25 52:4
239:17,19	168:12	267:12	335:17	90:4
281:9	destabilizat	determinance	deterministi	107:20
description	ion 79:19	191:11	c 21:16	148:24
10:25 12:1	destabilize	determinatio	dev 53:21	156:20
189:5	313:25	n 44:23	develop 24:4	247:6
deserted	314:6	183:15	32:6,12	249:24
343:6	destabilizin	191:13	35:23	253:24
deserves	g 79:16,23	253:24	217:8	294:3
66:15	destruction	289:16	288:2	313:2
design	253:2,25	335:25	294:6	315:14
29:7,9	254:6	340:11,17	developed	developments
32:15,17,1	286:10	determinatio	17:25	34:20
9	detail 29:12	ns 150:6	19:19	develops
33:5,12,19	30:12,24	175:24	20:2,11,15	222:10
35:23 45:1	256:7	262:20	35:22	deviated
46:11	267:1	determine	45:18 46:8	59:8
106:4,5	detailed	20:7 23:1	78:10	deviations
107:1	29:9 33:5	25:4 52:22	106:11	51:19
109:15	125:21	58:15 99:4	108:4,5	57:16,24
110:5	150:2	108:8	132:1	devices 14:2
111:20	193:1	109:3,11	147:8	devolution
120:11	218:4	110:1	148:19	228:7
124:17,18	226:15	111:12	149:13	dewatered
125:20,21	289:15,23	120:12	177:11	113:19
168:6	293:18	133:10	267:15	293:21
192:23	306:2	167:18	274:20	dewatering
196:7	309:24	169:24	291:15	20:4
226:12	details 29:6	176:3	294:21	162:9,11
267:2,9	34:2 35:23	198:20	330:19	193:9
289:4,6,17	50:3 162:5	204:8	Developer	205:22
309:24,25	214:14	230:4	55:20 56:5	207:9
322:17	267:14,17	232:22	176:4	291:23
designed	304:9,25	278:20	198:10	335:9
15:25	305:1,14	305:17	Developer's	DFO
43:10,20	307:25	331:1	16:25	32:4,8,10,
80:21	309:13,23	determined	34:10	14,19
98:23	detalir	47:23	107:16	33:2,5,7,1
152:2	305:1	116:11	291:23	8,22,25
167:25	detect 35:6	126:14	developing	114:19
designing	105:6	198:13	30:19	116:12
35:5 105:6	184:2,21	243:6	80:20	120:11
222:11	186:2,9	267:3	174:17	144:7
227:1	267:5	290:22	300:4	152:7,16
designs		determining	development	

369				
298:25	58:8 59:18	238:15,17	Dianna 4:12	63:3,21
299:1,2,23	61:14	239:8	Diavik 8:11	123:17
302:6,17,2	62:9,15	261:11,13	24:12	124:5
1 303:6	63:18	278:6,8	26:23	126:21
304:12	64:21	279:2	27:4,8	different
306:11	65:3,20	280:11	32:3	11:13
321:19	66:2,14	282:8	110:15	34:15
330:19	67:3 68:3	286:24	127:4,6,13	48:15 66:9
DFO's 144:15	74:20 77:1	287:23	,16	67:9,20
152:1	78:9 80:2	288:1,20	128:2,3,5,	79:10
153:6	83:16 84:4	289:3,14	9,20 140:9	80:25 81:5
286:24	85:11	290:2,6	141:13	102:13
303:9	87:7,12,25	292:3,10,1	142:5	104:12
322:16	95:6	8	147:4,11,2	114:15
dialogue	100:15	293:6,11,1	2 156:15	122:22
336:22	101:23	5,19,25	188:8,11	123:23
Diamond 1:6	106:23	294:15	201:3,8,11	124:20,21
2:18 8:11	107:14	295:2	,15	138:10,14
9:8	108:24	302:14,16	202:4,11	146:14
11:1,5,9,1	109:25	308:2	216:7	178:16
5 15:11	111:11	309:11	217:16	185:13
16:12,21	112:5	320:11,13	229:6	195:3
17:14 22:3	115:9	331:18,20	230:16	197:15
23:22	116:1,11	333:13	234:15,18	205:10
24:9,21	120:3,10	335:6,15,2	235:8,11,1	222:8
25:11,17,1	124:2	0	8,24	224:12
9,25	125:18	336:6,8,14	236:1,25	226:7
26:2,8,14,	126:14	,19	237:2	229:6
23,24	127:4,21	339:23,25	238:4	238:21
27:3,4,7,1	128:16	341:13,22	260:23	247:16
6,21,22	130:16	342:2	Diavik's	253:9
28:8,17,22	131:22	Diamonds	19:1	263:11
29:6,22	133:2	51:23 60:3	127:23	314:25
30:3,19	135:6,22	115:16	230:4	315:1,9
31:13,16	137:3,16	148:9,23	234:20,25	317:17,18,
32:6,13,16	138:10	165:14		21 325:9
,21	139:9	174:5	dictate	differential
33:3,4,10,	140:22	175:4	287:8	79:11 82:3
11,24,25	142:11	203:17	301:11,21	173:2
34:12	143:18	282:24	dictates	Differentiat
35:16,19,2	147:18	Diamond's	287:6	ing 80:8
2	155:14	29:5 61:7	330:20	differs
36:1,5,22	156:15	161:24	differ 169:4	174:18
37:9,24	176:9	173:22	difference	178:16
38:11 39:1	186:7	288:8	123:3,11	difficult
41:7 43:19	188:22,24	292:7	205:3	228:3
44:23 46:7	189:15	322:19	210:20	diffusion
50:7	190:4	Diamonds's	247:17	325:3
51:4,13	219:23	296:23	differences	
53:21 55:2	230:6			
	234:16			

370				
dig 83:18	343:12	4 56:22	333:14	93:13
84:8 94:17	dilution	60:3	discussed	258:7
95:9	268:10	61:3,5,10,	45:1 46:11	disrupt
dignified	dimensional	11 111:15	50:3 84:5	39:15
328:13	19:10	139:24	124:5	167:24
dike 36:24	21:23	140:8,9,25	158:4	219:4
42:10,11	dip 264:19	141:1	204:21	dissolved
76:15	dire 61:10	142:5	250:10	19:22 23:3
77:2,4	direct 49:20	143:5,10,1	341:23	158:25
89:5,9	54:20	3 147:4	discussing	205:7
113:15,21	61:10	157:14	24:6 245:8	distances
125:8,13,1	89:13	169:22	discussion	288:1
8 126:5	204:13	205:9,17	9:5 68:11	distinction
146:7	255:24	206:11	76:2	69:17
189:14	270:5	208:13	109:14	distribution
190:1	322:25	209:18	116:13	293:23
205:20	directed	211:14,16	189:19	disturbance
207:8	182:6	212:3	225:13	322:3
216:1,11	217:13	220:9,19,2	226:22	disturbances
217:22	direction	0 224:11	262:9,12	258:9
264:3,16	39:22	235:22	283:13	disturbed
288:24	166:17	284:7	306:23	221:18
296:8	directly	discharged	discussions	diversion
323:16,19,	77:25	59:21	15:16	32:16,23
24	150:5	207:18	19:11	33:2 144:3
diked 29:1	157:23	208:1	116:12	288:14,23
42:17,20,2	189:4	210:11,13	124:20	289:4,5,6,
1 54:19	228:25	220:24	139:18	9,12,15,24
77:17	244:16	discharges	222:7	303:21
113:12	265:23	18:7 24:12	224:18	322:8,10
119:24	director	discharging	243:8	diversions
146:12	202:24	30:3 55:4	266:5	288:10
291:22	338:8	58:9	293:14	290:4
292:20,21	disagree	141:13	321:14	division
diked-off	55:6 104:9	209:22	disgusting	51:2 203:4
291:22	306:6	210:6	82:25	divvied
dikes 76:11	disagrees	211:19	disparaging	250:23
119:10	24:9 34:12	219:23	82:14	251:1
205:22	discharge	220:4	disperse	DKFN 7:21
217:6	18:4 20:8	268:3	31:24	10:9
335:8	22:11,20	disco 164:3	disposal	116:22
dike's	24:8,11	discourages	196:5	119:4
125:24	28:5 30:2	315:14	199:10,17	120:2,15
dilatory	51:21,22	discuss	325:3	127:1
286:18	53:15	17:21 27:5	disposing	188:7
diligence	54:20,21,2	177:23	203:24	234:14
141:21		240:18	disputing	
		266:6		

371				
277:21	26:2,8,14,	103:9	188:21,24	320:10,13
301:5	24	104:9,14	189:15	322:19
302:2	27:3,7,16,	106:20,23	190:4	331:17,20
319:25	21,22	107:14	191:22	333:13
321:1,3	28:8,17,22	108:24	203:17	335:6,15,2
332:19	29:5,22	109:25	204:16	0
339:19	30:3,19	111:11	205:25	336:5,8,14
DKFN's	31:13,16	112:5	208:16,23	,19
321:14	32:5,12,16	115:8,9,16	210:7	339:22,23,
doable	,21	116:1,11	213:8,23	25
326:23	33:3,4,9,1	119:8,22	214:16	341:13,14,
Doan 7:13	0,24,25	120:3,10	215:4,10	19,21
docket	34:12	124:2,9	217:13	342:2,4,6
251:11	35:16,19,2	125:18	219:23	Dominion's
document	2	126:14	221:21	39:17
156:14	36:1,5,22	127:21	230:6,16	130:9
287:14	37:3,9,24	128:16	232:17	131:7
documented	38:11 39:1	130:3,16	235:9,18,2	158:7
72:23	41:7	131:1,22	3 237:5	164:21
122:16,22	43:1,19	133:2	238:14,17	166:4
258:6	44:23 46:7	135:6,12,2	239:8,16,2	209:16
documents	50:7	2 136:6	4 244:17	214:22
166:13	51:4,13,23	137:3,16	256:10	215:8
248:15	52:2 53:21	138:10	261:10,13	216:1
309:2	55:2 57:6	139:9	266:3,10,1	223:20
dog 292:12	58:8 59:18	140:22	9	267:25
domestic	60:3,13	142:11	267:13,19	done
177:8	61:7,14	143:18	268:4	15:17,22,2
246:20	62:9,15	147:18	278:5,8	3 40:22
Domi 288:20	63:10,18	148:8,23	279:2,13	69:2,21
Domin 60:3	64:21	150:10	280:1,11	72:24
dominant	65:3,20	151:18	281:8,17,1	80:17
170:8	66:2,14	152:23	8,22	81:12,14
171:22	67:3 68:3	155:14	282:5,8,24	92:20,22
Dominion 1:6	70:15	159:8	286:24	93:19 96:6
2:18 3:13	74:20	161:24	287:23	103:20
9:8	75:22	162:1,22	288:1,8,20	109:1
11:1,5,9,1	77:1,19	163:8,15	289:3,14	117:10
5 14:21	78:9 80:2	164:23	290:2,6	118:3,20
15:8,11	83:16 84:4	165:14,18	292:3,7,10	119:19
16:12,21	85:11	166:20	,18	122:2
17:13 22:3	86:22,25	167:6	293:5,11,1	123:9
23:22	87:7,12,19	168:10	5,18,25	126:9
24:9,21	,25 88:18	169:23	294:15	128:11
25:11,17,1	89:18	170:10	295:2	131:16
9,25	92:14	172:23,25	296:22	133:5
	93:19 95:6	173:22	302:13,16	140:6,8
	98:13	174:5	303:5	141:21
	100:1,7,8,	175:4	308:2	142:15
	9,15	176:9	309:11	146:16
	101:23	186:7	315:23	

372				
152:4	6 172:7	134:12	190:22,24	Dufour 6:17
159:19	223:8	drop 48:2,4	193:18	duly 236:18
180:18	Dr 14:19,20	73:22	194:1	Dupuis 4:14
190:2	116:24	drought	196:4	dur 227:20
195:5	137:20	76:16	197:4,12,1	duration
198:18	138:24	291:7	7,20 198:1	116:5
219:2	139:17	dry 20:4	204:9,18,2	324:19
220:18	141:11	du 18:1,8	3,25	during 14:8
221:24	142:24	20:18,21	205:4,6,22	17:2,17
249:13	143:25	22:20 24:8	206:2,23	18:4,5
269:20	144:16	27:13 28:5	207:14,18	19:20
274:18	146:19	31:10	208:1,13	20:4,9,18,
277:7,14	148:1	42:2,16	210:13	22 22:11
279:15	149:23	44:12	211:12,23	23:21,23
299:19	196:16	46:23	217:23	25:18,21
310:5	197:6	47:2,16,19	220:11,24,	27:4,14
315:24	198:8	,23	25 238:23	29:1,17,24
334:6	200:5	48:6,24	252:25	30:7,18
341:9	203:4,7	49:5,9	253:25	31:15
343:8	273:23	54:24	254:1,2	33:6,19
Donihee 2:16	274:8	69:4,10	258:19	35:9 36:2
38:22,23	282:22	71:6,14,22	263:9	45:6
62:22,23	283:16	72:4,5,15	264:15	50:3,4,8,9
63:6	284:10	99:13	266:21	51:18
87:17,18	321:7	104:24	287:4	53:25
200:25	326:8,12	106:1	289:1,25	54:19
201:1	drain 21:22	107:4	290:8,21	57:17,25
202:3	97:4,7	108:17	291:23	69:1 70:23
252:2,3	drainages	112:7,13	292:15,21,	74:3 102:4
271:16,17	289:25	118:19,23	22 293:20	106:4
279:17,18	draining	119:21	294:5	109:1,7
281:5,6	76:18	139:25	296:2,14	112:21
304:3	draw 207:3	145:20	297:4	114:18
306:3	drawn 274:4	150:11	305:21,22	116:14
340:3,18	drink 264:20	153:4	306:24	119:19
Doolittle	drinking	157:11,25	323:18	124:5
1:12	127:12,13	159:4	335:9	137:10
306:19,20	128:4	162:16,19	340:5,12,1	142:17
308:6	177:8	163:7	5	143:20
double	241:24	164:21	due 19:19	157:21
217:20	256:6	165:7	47:14	159:20
doubt 165:15	270:5	166:7	141:21	161:5
191:8	drive 40:5	168:15,24	149:20	163:10
313:5,12	driven 40:24	169:20	165:12	195:24
Doug 7:13	41:5 134:3	170:1,4	208:13	205:21
downstream	driver	171:14	281:14,15	206:2
18:7 44:7		172:17	295:21	207:17,19,
57:7 61:15		177:7	296:8	22
127:9,10,1		187:3,4,13	Duffy 3:12	208:11,14

373				
209:12,15, 18 210:2 211:5,12 212:9 213:18 214:2 215:6,11 216:1,6,11 218:7,10 220:3 227:12,16, 21 236:10 252:22 280:18 288:4,22 289:20 290:1 291:5,6,25 292:20,25 295:6,7 298:7 300:13 309:8 323:13 324:1,11 325:13 330:25 335:14,19, 21 341:21 342:25	<hr/> E <hr/> EA 19:20 21:12,17 22:17 24:11 27:2 53:7 57:19,24 58:16 59:8,12 60:21 94:9 104:15 107:8 175:3 236:8,21 283:19 305:1 342:15,18 EA14314-01 1:5 earlier 61:12 77:9 85:12 105:16 118:13 122:25 133:2,3 153:23 155:6 168:23 190:16 195:6 210:7 212:2,3 219:1,9 220:4,9 221:16 225:17 227:23 228:14 235:17 239:16,19 253:4 258:14 266:19 296:12 297:24 317:8 326:16 327:1	early 33:15 35:6 49:22 58:23,25 69:5 105:6 110:9 161:20 164:13 193:3 196:8 210:3 219:24 221:20 341:18 earth 248:17 earthquakes 258:10 ease 100:10 easier 144:1 easiest 280:15 easily 115:5 eastern 69:12 easy 314:10 315:17 eat 171:11 172:19,21 eating 164:9 ebullition 325:4 EC 266:9 267:20 268:11 271:2 272:6 275:22 276:20 echo 263:22 ecological 180:8 322:11 ecologically 17:8 176:17	economic 250:2 ecosystem 129:23 205:16 209:8 EC's 266:1 271:25 Ed 8:4 EDenholm 3:22 15:4 edges 165:19 edible 170:9 171:24 274:2 Edward 7:17 effect 30:20 31:19 47:13 49:21 94:25 141:25 142:5 151:16 169:13 183:6,9 191:14 196:23 210:18 220:8,10 237:25 effective 24:23,24 51:15 162:17 176:17 227:20 230:5 effectively 51:15 157:13 227:16 228:1,4 effects 11:11 17:7 20:20 27:5	33:8,13,17 34:9,16,18 ,19,22 41:1 44:25 46:8 48:18 49:1 65:14 66:7,8 67:6,19 73:22 99:18 104:11,13 106:2,10 107:21 108:25 109:15 110:5 111:20 118:22 126:16 127:9,15 128:9 143:21 146:1 147:3,8 148:6 157:8,21 158:9 165:8 167:12 176:13 178:21 187:23 198:14,20 219:1 229:8,19,2 2 237:2 258:5 266:16,18, 20,23,24 267:5,12,1 4 270:6 284:6 287:3,12 290:12,18 291:8,11 293:22 effluent 51:21,22 52:3 57:19 58:2 60:4 111:15

374				
162:14	234:4	312:20	36:15,21	46:15 50:4
168:23	269:25	elevation	37:17,22,2	81:13
169:8,10,1	270:5	42:12	4 38:4	107:23
1,12,24,25	279:13	Elkin 5:22	160:22,24,	109:1,2,7,
170:7,13	292:21	Elli 77:8	25 173:25	8,14
192:21	304:7	Ellie 3:9	175:5	110:4,6,23
203:22	312:1	Elliot 2:19	192:1,13	,25 116:14
205:11,13	315:8,9	50:6 80:1	193:23	143:20
207:18	333:4	92:13	218:25	147:22
208:21	Ekati 25:12	124:1	219:19	152:6
209:17	29:11,21,2	125:17	221:3	181:21
210:12	3 30:12,23	151:10,17	Emily 3:7	292:8
211:14,16,	32:3 44:8	152:22	emit 75:3	302:18
19 219:24	54:23	Elliott 29:4	en 68:20	engaging
220:20	100:17	77:8	189:16	315:25
269:7,23	101:24	Elmar 7:23	Ena 248:22	engineered
270:5	110:15	116:24	enable 193:2	123:12,14
326:4	130:17	117:3	encapsulatio	engineering
effort 38:17	179:16	120:16,18,	n 194:25	189:7
efforts	203:17	19,22,23	195:15,17	English 14:3
316:1	204:1	321:7	enclosure	245:1
egg 84:21	206:6,24	326:6,8,9,	324:19	246:1,4
85:5 166:1	207:11	12	encounter	248:20
199:13	209:9	Elmer 122:10	50:12	enhance
288:5	211:7	125:1,3,6,	encourage	214:21
eggs	213:2	7,25	126:19	215:8
166:24,25	214:11	126:2,17	end-of-pipe	enhanced
167:4	219:17	327:21	169:22	20:25
199:19	225:19	else 38:13	energy 83:22	153:14
307:5	258:15	113:22	enflu 170:13	enhancement
Ehrlich 2:12	Ekati's	299:16	enforced	299:9
149:25	179:17	elsewhere	286:17	ENR
150:1	elaborate	115:5	engage 17:14	5:19,20,21
152:11	265:1	176:21	27:7	,22,23
153:18	269:12	305:25	32:8,19	55:16
261:18,21	Elder 8:4	embarrassed	33:25	59:6,24
262:18	13:18,19	252:19	110:22	63:2 65:8
264:25	246:8	emerge	294:15	68:20
eight 35:13	Elders 69:2	163:13	engaged 27:3	174:24
126:23	76:22	emerged	33:19	179:1
151:14	249:5,14	167:5	engagement	220:16
either 28:24	electro-	emergency	15:18	239:23
77:25	fishing	284:18	35:8,24	242:16
84:16	292:5	336:18	45:3,4	259:21
100:3	elements	Emery 7:8		297:15
160:8	92:19			318:21
171:9	130:17			329:14
197:18	elephant			

375				
338:14	104:7,20	34:14,16	error 82:9	establishing
ensure	105:8	35:12 36:3	252:20	131:8
102:3,14	106:25	52:25	escapes	establishmen
129:24	108:12	105:20	216:6	t 25:24
132:8	109:17	160:17	escaping	26:3
170:2	111:3,23	167:25	217:18,23	129:22
195:21	158:9	181:15,18	Esford 3:17	181:14,25
207:4	173:15	182:20	Esker 189:22	228:10,20
214:5	174:6,18	191:14		274:19
222:18	175:20	203:16	especially	estimate
236:3	183:19,21	211:10	71:9 86:18	19:5,6
268:14	193:14	212:20	171:10	21:11
276:11	202:25	228:11,14	179:12	22:18,24
279:14	203:14	262:24	184:14	23:6 53:2
280:16,20	214:15	263:2	225:21	94:10
288:3	220:11	266:16	258:18	96:24
289:10	231:7,9	334:14,17	295:16	118:5
291:8	241:14	342:8,24	316:9	148:16
294:17	260:7,9	environmenta	essence	149:9,21
296:10	265:14,20,	lly 16:1	222:17,24	150:13
entail 142:3	22	envisioned	236:21	151:3
entanglement	266:1,22,2	239:21	265:22	estimated
75:15	5	envy 76:1	essentially	205:12
entertained	267:4,5,18	Enzoe 6:6	83:21	238:22
44:16	268:4,13,1	13:17,19	105:5	295:21
entire 165:1	7 269:9,15	equ 40:10	222:9	estimates
entity	270:10	equal 122:6	226:25	12:5
112:8,13	271:2,6	212:23	235:14	272:8,17
enumerated	272:5,13	243:5	236:22	330:25
323:6	273:13,25	263:24	252:12	et 227:14
330:17	274:4,17,2	297:25	306:7	evaluate
Envi 326:16	2 275:3	307:8	Essery	17:25 20:1
environment	276:1,19	equality	254:14	22:10 59:3
6:15 9:22	277:5	103:6	establish	94:23 96:7
12:2	278:10,18	equilibrium	287:16	134:6
18:4,7	279:3,11	40:10	313:21	161:4
24:19	281:20,22	equipment	established	168:10
27:12	282:24	74:7,22	130:10	219:23
28:11,24	283:12,15,	Eric 3:22	153:8	evaluated
30:14 34:8	23 284:3	4:18 15:3	161:15	28:3 77:20
35:19,21	286:17	erosion	162:14	83:11
51:2	300:20,22	289:18	170:22	94:15
54:5,20	319:10,12	311:9,13	216:11	103:21
57:7 59:22	326:17	erosional	223:21	118:22
60:13	330:7,9	31:25	224:23	127:15
61:9,15	339:5,7		257:16,19	209:21
103:2,4	environmenta		258:17	266:21
	l 1:2			evaluating
	13:11 17:3			
	25:2 26:5			
	27:4,9,25			

376				
28:3	263:19	92:11	exotic 78:3	41:13
204:11	evict 250:15	117:9	80:6	272:7,15
evaluation	evicting	121:9	expanse	278:20
29:15,22	249:23	131:15	253:8	332:2,12,2
128:6,11	evidence	204:19	expect 37:19	1 333:7
162:6	26:6 72:1	233:24	60:22	expertise
206:5	135:12	241:8	107:18	95:20
209:22	166:13	256:9	114:1	190:3
211:19,20	279:23	314:22	139:1	228:1
212:7	280:13	316:4	141:14	229:16
279:11	281:11,19,	325:2,11	169:4	274:23
event 53:16	24 282:13	exceed 268:1	187:4	275:22,24
55:20,24	342:22	288:4,6	216:10	276:17
61:1 82:17	exact 127:24	exceedance	311:17	experts
84:15,18	160:5	193:20	333:13	124:15
85:19	307:21	exceedances	expectation	191:7
144:22	309:13	268:6	49:7 284:1	229:15,16
161:14	exactly	exceeded	expectations	257:17
169:3	92:16	175:9	99:5	324:15
175:3	102:7	exceeding	expected	explain 11:9
180:19	158:12	193:19	22:5	43:14 67:4
215:25	172:15	exceeds	30:10,22	150:20
216:5	195:12	284:3	32:24 82:9	152:13
288:6	250:19	excellent	99:18	198:17
291:16	263:20	296:20	125:22	explanation
316:19	304:7,18	except	130:19	251:25
323:5	326:14	154:19	167:15	explicit
events 39:14	exam 117:8	exchange	209:3	237:14
eventually	example	325:1,8	213:23	explore
99:24	32:24 33:4	exchanges	268:1	341:15
257:7	55:24	176:6	293:21	explosives
everybody	82:22 89:2	excuse 18:10	307:19	286:25
13:20	94:6 102:2	304:21	expecting	exposed
241:2	106:12,14	exist 52:2	113:23	61:22 63:5
328:14	121:3	100:1,3	expects	64:5,7
332:22	122:23	207:19	162:1	90:9
everyone	139:23	245:12	167:21	169:7,10
13:4	149:14	existing	169:5	exposures
14:7,10,24	159:3	34:20	expel 213:18	65:15
16:14 76:4	178:18	64:13	experience	126:22,23
118:3	185:11	117:8	218:18	expressed
155:3	204:20,25	210:15	246:16	192:21
245:14	205:18	214:22	326:23	264:3
255:13	299:11	215:9	experiencing	316:24
257:14	examples	240:3	246:15	expressing
everything	86:23		expert 12:3	19:19
113:22	88:18			
154:19	89:18			

377				
expressions	129:22	60:18	favours 92:9	97:14,23
105:8	289:7	69:11 75:9	fears 170:7	fifth 156:16
extended	325:7	76:9 80:11	feasible	fifty 95:22
191:16	facility	95:10,11	147:13	98:8
291:7	99:20	151:20	217:20	225:23
extends	137:13	158:20	feathers	258:4
204:9	172:8	201:3	270:6	figure
extensive	fact 42:5	256:19,21	features	22:12,16
15:18,24	47:24	257:25	288:15	23:2
88:20	53:12	faith 315:21	305:12	file 252:7,9
extensively	69:14 72:3	Faithful	federal	280:1
316:6	92:22	3:18	234:4	281:11,22,
extent 27:20	164:23	15:2,13	248:10	24 341:24
34:17,19	166:1	16:8,13,15	336:23	filed 202:11
61:9	172:4	26:21,22	feed 134:7	249:21
128:16	190:12,13	52:15,16	139:12	279:21,23
146:17	197:7	56:10 58:7	171:17	334:23
178:9	264:18	59:17 60:9	feel 124:17	files 271:10
207:12	314:10	68:13	172:22	filing
240:21	317:15	98:18	211:13	249:19
241:7,8,21	324:21	119:15	225:12	250:22
290:20	factor 21:25	134:1	229:4	341:25
305:17,21	39:25 41:1	157:5	236:7,20	342:3
external	factors	158:17	250:23	filings
229:16	11:14	fall 111:21	255:9	341:23
275:23	67:12	167:1	261:13	fill 11:8
extra 54:9	68:12,15	303:10	265:2	62:7,19
305:16	313:18,24	307:6	296:22	64:11
extraction	324:25	familiar	315:22	155:11
316:2	fail 162:13	80:4 118:4	328:10	filled 52:4
extreme	314:13,20,	fan 312:12	329:1	77:7
20:10 24:1	22	fantastic	333:4	207:25
39:14	316:12,18,	272:3	feels 315:22	253:17
41:18 94:6	19	Faro 86:24	333:2	filling 62:1
118:8	failed	256:15	feet 343:7	final 25:12
122:4	314:21	fashion	fell 234:3	33:12
218:25	failure	89:11	332:4	46:20
extremely	84:16	fast 5:2	fertilizer	61:18
174:16	193:3	41:8	292:13	106:21
faced 247:6	fair 14:11	fata 34:2	fetch 39:20	114:17
face-to-face	47:4 89:17	fate 292:20	42:4,15,18	120:2
252:23	129:15	Fatt 6:7	field 124:16	133:8
facilitate	287:18	favourable	193:15,17,	175:14
	296:18,19	37:12	25	213:1
	305:5		fifteen	218:24
	fairly 15:24			226:10,15
	41:8 45:21			

378				
281:16	firmly	225:16	2,25	178:21
296:21	255:23	227:10	33:8,17	184:2,5,6,
305:1	first 6:3	228:21	34:3,12,23	7,12,13
313:13	19:10	231:18	,24	185:9,24
317:5	25:23,24	234:12	35:1,18	186:4,21
326:5	28:12,13,1	244:3,11	47:14,23	187:18,23
341:12	8 30:1	245:1	48:7,21	190:9,19
342:1	39:11 52:1	246:22	49:9	191:7
finalization	68:23	254:24	50:2,14	196:20,23
292:24	75:25 78:9	255:2,14,1	69:7,9,18,	197:4,5,9,
finalized	80:2 85:14	5,23 257:1	22	11,19,22
114:18	86:14,16,2	259:24	71:12,24	199:19
226:16,20	1 88:15	260:19,21	72:9,18,19	204:21,22,
309:14	89:15	262:5,15	73:1,3,6,1	24 205:24
finally	90:24	263:13	2,23,24	211:11
20:10 36:1	91:18	266:8	75:12	238:20
172:22	93:12	274:11,15,	87:1,20	241:25
203:24	94:21	17 275:1,6	88:2	245:18
325:25	95:13,17	277:19	105:10,12,	253:2,5
finding	98:1 99:22	280:1	15,21	254:1
49:10	101:9	295:24	106:13,16	263:24
182:17	102:11	297:18,22,	107:1,2,3,	264:1,16
findings	103:5	24 298:19	6,8,16,17,	274:2
70:14	116:20,23	299:15	25	286:4,6,9,
fine 25:18	117:4	300:2	112:6,7,11	11,14,15,1
43:4 130:6	121:16,17,	301:3,6	113:6	9
134:22	24 124:6	312:1,6,8,	115:2,5	287:4,12,1
136:9,21	131:11,23	14,24	116:25	7
241:4	132:4	318:25	120:3	288:11,15
255:6	134:8	319:22	129:25	289:5,7,11
269:13	136:13	320:24	144:4	,18
fine-	144:20	321:18,20,	150:11,15,	290:14,21,
processed	152:23	24 325:15	17,20	25
136:15,18	153:7	326:8,13	151:7,9,14	291:9,19,2
239:14	156:16	327:2	152:8	2,25
fines	163:3,5	328:2	155:7,12,1	292:2,4,5,
323:12,23	173:18,20	329:17,21,	6 163:9,16	7,12,16,20
finish 317:4	175:21	23 331:24	164:11,14,	293:8,20,2
318:3	176:6	333:9	20,25	3
finished	179:4,6,9,	334:19	165:1,2,10	294:10,18
221:21	11 180:16	338:17,21,	,12,13	295:5,14,1
310:21	181:4	23 339:17	167:4	6,25
finite	188:5	Firstly	169:18	296:25
207:24	189:4	18:24 24:6	170:9,13,1	297:3,6,25
Fiona 3:17	193:24	269:7	8	298:4,11
	203:18	fish 11:16	171:1,4,7,	299:16
	204:20	16:18	11	301:9
	221:8,10,1	17:7,12,13	172:19,21	303:8,13,1
	3,15	31:20	173:3,4,6	4,21,22,25
	223:15	32:12,18,2	176:25	304:8
	224:21		177:13	305:4,7,23

379				
306:24	291:2,13,1	Fist 227:4	310:17	296:9
307:1,9,10	5	fit	flows 113:16	forage
,24	292:6,9,17	247:1,2,3	146:7	292:15
308:10,14,	293:4,14,1	312:19	159:21	foraging
16	6,24	317:24	288:18	72:22
310:7,13,1	294:2,4,7,	five 52:5	289:17	forced
7,20,21	11,14,22,2	60:4 62:1	fluctuations	118:21
322:2,7,13	4	200:13	74:1	forces 41:5
,18	295:19,23	243:15,22	flurry 176:6	foremost
323:3,9	296:22	312:20	fluxing	295:24
325:23	297:1	fix 85:6	77:24	299:15
326:5,18,2	298:6	flags 271:8	focus 16:18	foreseeable
2,24	299:5	flea	176:24	34:20 85:2
327:18	300:1	169:16,17	211:21	forever
328:7	301:6,10	flesh 241:7	293:16	95:18
330:17,21,	303:11,15	fleshed	focussed	102:15
23,24,25	304:22	97:11	19:17	257:3
331:5	306:12,13	316:20,25	20:25	forgive
fished 69:18	307:12	fleshing	106:1	280:21
114:24	308:12	146:10	focusses	form 19:25
Fisher 4:24	309:10,19	flexibility	165:6	20:1
fisheries	310:12	55:9,12	203:19	23:1,11,18
6:9 10:3	311:3	60:14	focussing	81:23
105:10	319:13,17	61:14	178:22	90:19
112:1,2,23	330:10,12	139:21	folks 40:2	96:12
144:8	339:8,10	141:3,5,24	217:15	117:14,23
151:21	fishery	173:22	271:9	118:7,11
165:23	269:10	174:9,11,2	321:6	201:15
169:21	286:6,7	2 208:17	338:6	213:10
177:8	fishing	210:14	followup	258:9
183:22,24	69:8,15	fli 22:1	66:5	289:11
184:15	77:3 155:9	flight 201:6	follow-up	332:23
185:9,22	245:17	flips 160:18	27:24 56:2	formal 38:6
187:21	256:4	flooding	174:25	236:8,21
231:10,12	fishout	23:12	185:23	331:3
260:10,12	330:18,20,	42:10	294:20	341:10
269:8,10	22,24,25	50:8,9	317:7	343:18
273:9	331:2	flow 18:3	food 163:13	formally
275:12,14	fish-out	73:22	171:7,10,1	321:21
284:25	33:23	74:1,3	6,19 172:2	formation
285:3,10,1	34:1,3	76:11 77:2	173:3	213:18
1,13,14,20	150:9,10	90:10,12	184:13	291:18
,21,23,24	151:19	146:7	292:13	formed 94:13
286:8,12	292:20,24	166:17	343:5	forming
287:1,6,14	302:18	309:24	footprint	324:10
,15,22	303:11		28:10	
288:11	304:1			
289:2,8,13	310:10			
,14,22	323:2,5			
290:5,10				

380				
formulation 293:6	fracture 21:2	frequent 253:5	full 22:3 42:15	197:18 215:11
Fort 128:24 188:12,15 238:5 252:7 260:25 277:22 302:8 320:1 331:12 339:20	fram 49:22 frame 23:14 138:3 267:6 frames 161:20 278:11 framework 33:14 45:19 46:12 49:22 108:3 148:18 170:16 216:12	frequented 286:19 fresh 79:4 210:21 211:1,3 213:6,13 fresher 78:6 79:8 97:15,22 freshet 313:23 freshwater 24:22 25:5 79:4 90:12 97:11,16 103:8,12,14 123:16,20 131:17 132:5,16 133:4,16,2 1 134:9,11 146:7,24 208:24 209:24 268:8,16 316:13 fresh-water 103:21,23 friend 316:7 friends 102:2 185:10 front 14:14 160:10,12 200:14 255:5 312:2 343:13 frozen 195:22 fry 173:6 fuel 72:24	64:16,23 66:16 77:5 83:21 85:13 95:9 100:21,22 154:12 182:20 240:7 257:14 277:11 fully 118:19 139:4 146:5 261:25 263:15 342:10 fulsome 66:23 function 21:2 149:11 322:11 functional 115:11 functions 32:24 114:2 funding 181:14,20, 25 182:10 228:2,6,10 ,15,21 funds 181:22 Furthermore 105:25 256:1 future 25:21 33:21 62:4 80:23 81:24 82:12 106:4 115:11 141:6 177:6	218:5 226:18 233:11 235:10 236:23 237:3,9,24 245:10 247:20 249:12 313:17 <hr/> G Gaeleen 2:20 gambling 76:5 gap 140:4,13 gardens 292:14 garnered 300:11 gasps 264:13 gathered 25:2 115:1 253:7 gauge 167:13 Gauthier 319:15,16 general 92:17 generally 47:2 264:13 generate 39:23 54:15 generated 39:19,25 42:21 99:19 generating 42:16 194:12,13 generation

381				
50:14	286:11	227:24	103:19	102:23,25
generations	giving 111:5	228:6,8,9,17,24	104:17	173:12,16
247:21	glad 245:19	229:3,13	105:4	181:7,9
249:12	327:5	230:14	108:3	202:15,18,
253:21	Glen 4:5	232:14	112:18	24 203:13
genocide	GNB 229:4	233:4,23	113:11	216:8,9
247:12,14	GNT 231:23	234:22,23	114:13,14	227:7,13
250:9,10	GNW 51:24	235:2	117:19	228:25
geochemical	228:24	236:2	119:16	233:12
180:12	GNWT 3:24	237:6,22	121:22	234:2,3,4,
Georgina	4:2 5:2	239:13,21	134:2	5 235:7
6:13	9:14 19:11	242:8	144:14	246:17
geotech	24:7,19	273:24	145:6	247:22
189:7	25:15	274:9	149:6	248:3,9,10
geotechnical	27:18	342:9,19,21	150:25	,25
180:12	41:12	1	154:11	249:12,22
gets 14:11	51:24 57:9	GNWT's 64:3	157:6	250:12,22
64:6 84:22	62:23	208:10	158:18	251:3
236:16	65:10,12	219:21	159:17	259:19
264:10	66:5	237:16	318:7	260:3,5
getting	67:16,18	goal 151:23	gone 98:6	265:11,13
38:19	68:9 81:13	212:22	100:5	273:21
79:18	123:10	243:4	124:23	275:9,11
168:18	137:25	goals 133:20	128:17	285:19
187:2	140:1,23	239:17,20,	220:7	297:12
189:19	178:4	25	256:7	298:22,24
224:3	181:13	go-around	312:16	300:18
325:6	200:13	180:16	314:7	302:4
gibberum	202:21	Golder 3:14	318:4,5	318:18
44:11	203:9	15:1,2,3	332:21	319:5,7
girls 343:13	204:3,10	16:16	goods	329:11
given 61:25	205:2,15,2	17:20	335:4,10	330:2,4
64:7	5	26:22 31:8	336:5,6,9	336:23
66:5,14	206:18,19	40:21 42:9	goodwill	338:12
82:7 103:7	207:6	48:12	315:21	339:1,3
130:8	211:3	49:16	Gord 8:11	governments
135:11	213:11,21	52:16	127:5,24	165:4
161:1	214:16	56:11 58:8	128:1,19	Grace 6:23
166:12	216:23	59:18	188:10	102:24
196:4	218:2	60:10	234:17	260:4
225:21	219:14	68:14	235:25	265:12
230:6	220:7	69:21	236:24	275:10
288:22	221:22	70:1,9,22	238:3,4	298:23
304:6	222:4	71:4 72:13	gotten	299:20
gives 82:25	223:3,20	80:15	332:22	300:17
100:23	224:9	89:1,24	government	gracious
	225:6,20	91:9 94:1	6:22 7:2	343:14
	226:4	96:4 98:19	15:21	gradient
			50:23 65:6	78:5

382				
79:6,16,23	290:22	263:5	201:11	115:3,5,17
grading	gravel	291:24	220:17	,18,19
123:6	166:23,25	300:6	225:3	116:2,3,6
gram 326:22	167:1,6	gruelling	233:12	144:4
grammar	grayling	150:2	235:22	153:14
314:1	288:12,16	Grum 86:24	237:15,21,	176:25
granite	great 26:4	256:15	25 240:8	177:13
194:14	52:21	guarantee	304:11	190:18
granted 83:5	56:25	95:21	306:5	197:4,21
252:14	60:14	98:10,13	308:7	205:24
Gras 18:2,8	61:13	223:5	313:5	211:11
20:18,22	123:6	225:7	315:7	241:25
27:6 28:6	245:17	guarantees	323:14,15	253:3
34:21	256:7	98:19,20	325:7	254:1,8
47:1,6,23	301:23	Gudmundson	Gugten 5:17	263:24
48:20,25	314:7	8:15	203:6	264:1,16
69:3	318:5,10	238:12,13	guidance	286:11
71:7,9,14,	greater	261:7,8	287:14	291:10
22 72:5,18	24:14 25:6	320:8,9	336:10	293:8
97:5 99:12	49:6 50:14	331:14,15	guidelines	294:18
112:9	155:20	334:12,13	95:7	296:3,12,1
118:19,23	171:15	337:9,13,1	103:14	4
140:7,14	187:23	4 340:7,8	127:11	297:3,7,25
141:14	212:16	Gudmundsun	164:9	298:5,9,12
142:1,6	greatly	188:18,19	268:1	,13 299:9
145:20	312:10	278:2,3	286:24	303:8,14,2
147:12	green 5:19	302:10,11	287:5	5 304:8,13
156:8,13,1	21:9	guess 16:5	Gunn 2:15	305:5,6,7,
8	ground 76:9	37:9 55:20	Gunnar 86:24	9,11
157:11,13,	79:21	59:6	256:14	306:24
18,20,23	121:3	72:2,7	guy 111:3	307:2,7
158:3,10	253:8	75:25 82:3	guys	308:10
159:5	grounds	99:23	249:23,25	317:9,11,1
162:20	76:24	111:3	308:11	6,19,23
177:7	groundwater	114:14		322:7,18
187:3	19:15	131:12	<hr/>	327:18
204:10	21:5,21,24	146:22	H	habitats
205:4	22:4 77:24	173:20	habitat	47:16
207:20	79:15	175:25	16:18	115:10
209:10	97:2,19,20	178:5,6,17	17:13	190:21
211:12	158:22,23,	179:23	31:20 32:1	295:6,25
229:8	24	180:5,25	33:8	half 160:4,5
230:24	group 229:18	187:22	34:12,23	hand 40:12
231:2	groups 45:5	191:6	47:4,10,19	80:12
234:20	181:21	196:1	48:6,18	154:11
238:24	228:2	197:14	72:15,21,2	170:10
252:25		198:9	2 112:7	178:20
266:20		199:1	113:6	264:15
268:3			114:8,15	handlers

383				
292:12	294:10	271:12	heart 329:2	16:19
handling	301:9	296:25	heavy 164:10	17:19,20
29:13 34:2	harmed 44:1	healthy	185:13,19	18:13
292:19	harmful	102:14,15	hectares	40:20,21
hands 183:11	170:13	295:15	113:20	42:8,9
316:6	Harrison 4:6	hear	height	80:14,15
handy 309:21	Harry 2:24	71:16,17	166:9,14	88:25
happen	hav 296:18	120:19	held 1:21	89:1,23,24
41:15,17	haven't 55:4	144:25	181:15	91:8,9
149:15	87:7,11	156:8	228:11	93:25 94:1
304:7	92:20	237:14	267:22	96:3,4
324:21	122:2	239:24	help 139:12	103:18,19
327:15	128:11	247:11	147:24	117:18,19
happened	139:24	302:6	229:21	121:21,22
11:16	140:1	326:9	241:6	145:5,6
79:12	141:18,25	heard 14:11	276:12	he's 116:25
82:20	146:16	47:24 59:7	279:15	155:3
87:20 88:1	167:5	60:1 95:15	280:16,20	203:2
happens	187:16	139:18	332:17	252:12
93:18 97:9	221:1	144:21	helped	321:7
100:5	243:1	161:8	262:25	hi 73:9
happily	270:12	168:22	343:3	127:5
165:2	316:23	212:2	helpful	132:13
happy 62:11	325:14	230:16	189:22	high 47:15
173:1	having 44:16	235:17	200:3	150:12
302:5	76:2 109:8	262:22	helping	166:10
316:9	190:3	279:7	328:17	172:13
341:2	194:17	288:8	343:13	205:9,20
hard 76:6	301:19	296:12	helps 152:11	209:11
186:16	322:16	324:5,7,8	262:23	210:9
230:4	323:8	343:10	331:1	233:9
313:16,17	Hawton 4:21	hearing 1:7	Henry 7:2	255:21
314:12	hazard 191:6	13:12,15	181:8,9	288:18
315:18	head 159:15	51:6	182:13	327:6
318:11	240:23	201:15	183:16	higher 23:10
harm 12:7,9	242:9	202:3	227:8	79:14
32:18	heads 62:13	262:10	229:2	123:24
164:22	healing	281:13	230:2	141:14
269:20	253:11	285:8	231:4	159:25
272:10,11,	health	341:14,25	herd 183:6	163:13
20,23	105:11	343:3	253:7	171:17
278:24	106:15	hearings	Here's	172:14
286:4,9	164:8,14	227:17,19,	256:13	298:13
287:17	171:4	21,25	Herrell 3:21	highlight
289:5,16	177:10,16	338:7	15:2,23	313:14
290:14	270:6,19	341:11,12		321:14
291:19		342:12		highlighted
		343:1,18		139:20

384				
141:23	hope 18:21	282:22,23	227:23	296:6,8,17
highly 34:24	165:2	283:16	228:5	305:3,4,5,
73:12,24	190:25	284:10	245:5	8 309:11
74:10	258:7	hyalella	264:16	330:21
84:24	263:5	126:8	282:8	335:20
126:19	271:14	hydro 49:25	283:3	identify
high-	328:12	166:11	285:12	24:15 57:1
salinity	hoped 327:16	hydrody	299:2	125:5
210:17	hopefully	148:14	304:11	167:25
hire 275:23	102:8	hydrodynamic	311:17	168:14
hired 263:14	159:16	19:4 22:25	312:8	246:5
hiring 332:1	222:21	40:23	317:13	290:13
historic	302:23	80:17	318:2,21	296:24
168:3	hoping	96:10	325:14	IEMA 7:8
history	118:15	99:13	329:23	9:11 46:17
316:2	133:16	hydrodynamic	331:20	73:21
holding	138:3	s 96:11	332:19	85:14
13:15	Hubert 2:2	hydrologic	idea 41:24	102:2
holds 231:19	huge 247:18	33:16 50:1	104:10	160:8,14
hole 76:9	255:19	hydrologists	153:25	173:17,20
253:15	human 164:15	166:12	243:3	175:2,15,2
holes	hundred	hydrology	267:21	0,25 176:1
308:1,4	23:13 81:9	33:11	309:17	178:6
Holland 2:19	95:15	276:7	311:1	179:16
29:4 50:6	96:9,15	290:16	ideally	181:10
80:1,2	98:8		263:19	182:15
92:13	151:6,14		ideas 299:8	188:24
124:1	209:4		300:15	189:6
125:17,18	225:23		identificati	191:19,23
151:10,17	258:4		on 192:18	193:19
152:22	hundreds	ice 69:4	identified	225:18
holomictic	72:20	213:18	25:7	227:23
122:19	253:15,16	307:19	45:15,21	271:18
Holopedium	hunting	ICRP 64:13	46:3	IEMA's 102:4
44:11	245:19	129:19	69:3,10,21	190:10
home 249:6	250:14	I'd 13:14	105:21	191:19
334:4	Hutchinson	65:8 75:25	107:25	258:13
343:6	2:14 14:20	80:2	161:17	325:22
homes 250:15	143:25	102:17	177:9	II 31:16
Hon 248:21	144:16	116:23	183:7	112:22
honest 73:7	146:19	132:4	192:25	118:12
328:13,19	148:1,7	145:6	204:3	II-24 118:17
	149:23	151:1	224:16	145:16
	196:16,17	155:7	266:2	I'll 16:7
	197:6,7	188:24	275:4	31:3 39:10
	198:8	197:2	286:22	51:7 53:3
	200:5	200:12	287:18	59:24
		211:25	292:3	60:17
			294:24	61:18

385				
80:12 84:8	156:24	328:3	304:11	294:5,7
101:15	160:16	332:8	310:16	295:5
117:1,2	175:1	333:10	impacted	296:24
121:17	176:16	334:13	197:23	301:23
145:12	177:23	337:13	248:13	303:8,13,2
177:25	184:19,23	340:25	250:19,25	4 304:17
182:8	185:3,8,20	immediate	288:13	341:17
217:14	187:2	203:2,7	294:16	impen 162:17
238:3	191:6	205:19	296:1,16	impending
243:21	194:6	284:2	298:13	164:13
285:6	196:12	immediately	299:16	170:25
286:21	198:14	81:21	310:20	implement
328:20	202:23	205:17	impacts	32:15
341:9	217:2	256:22	17:25 22:6	161:18
ill-equipped	219:5,7	257:20	27:20 46:4	174:20
263:15	220:7	imminent	91:22	289:3
illustrate	224:22	79:20	93:20	305:11
204:19	225:22	imp 296:3	94:24	implementati
illustrative	227:21	impact 1:3	104:23	on 161:16
239:1,6	231:24	13:11	105:20	162:7,17
I'm 13:10,20	237:21,25	128:5	112:6,13	192:24
16:15	238:1,17,1	147:4	150:7	193:5
17:18,20,2	9 239:25	150:21	152:18	implemented
1 26:19	240:20	151:23,25	158:8	55:21
38:15	241:2,4	152:1,15,2	162:15	215:8
40:14	244:24	4 153:4	163:11,13	249:17
43:12 48:5	245:19	165:16	165:6,10	267:10
50:25	248:20	166:1	168:7,11	294:20
53:25	249:10	170:18	170:25	303:8
57:21	250:7	171:4,10	172:16,18	326:3
64:12	251:5,12	178:7,9,17	173:2	implementing
66:22	253:22	182:17,20	186:23	51:17
68:24	255:13,15	183:2	197:8	implication
73:12,20	257:12	187:17	204:5,12,1	64:5
74:4,8,12	258:1	188:2	4,17	implications
76:4 82:14	259:3	190:10	205:4,23	55:22
86:18	261:14	193:15	206:5,16,2	235:22
89:25	262:11,15	197:4	2 207:4,8	implicit
91:18	263:12,14,	199:4,19,2	211:23	182:18
92:3,5	15 277:9	0	214:15	importance
93:12 98:2	278:8	203:21,24	221:17	17:12
100:23	279:5,6,7	205:6	225:21	115:6
101:17	280:12,14,	206:1,10	231:21	139:20
102:6	21,24	211:10	241:23	165:5
118:14	282:23	229:18	246:16	250:4
144:17	307:20,21	234:20	254:3	important
145:11	308:2,13	255:21	255:22,24	
150:1,4,8	309:5	291:9	256:1,3,5	
155:10	312:10,12	293:17	290:7,25	
	317:4,5	301:24	293:8,17	
	327:5			

386				
14:10 49:8	294:24	54:6 57:19	incorporates	257:16,17
51:5 63:2	in-between	110:6	164:20	324:14
74:15	323:19	118:4	incorporatin	331:24
78:19	Inc 8:12	157:16	g 298:4	332:2,6,11
114:24	include	164:10	incorporatio	,12,14
147:20	18:25	220:2	n 290:11	333:7
155:15	25:16	222:11	incorrect	indicate
164:16,17	27:19	250:11	279:6	27:15
174:16	29:12	258:22	increase	288:23
176:22	30:8,20	335:2	90:14	indicated
182:10	32:7	337:22	156:19	117:20,22
206:21	33:11,15	341:25	167:16	176:20
227:13,15,	46:12	342:23	168:2	191:17
25 252:25	49:22	including	171:13	202:11
256:8	68:11,15	11:14	172:2	213:9
264:1,20	86:23	23:15,25	187:5,14	268:7
267:8	106:12	33:20 34:2	209:24	indicates
287:16	110:19	67:11	210:8,20	21:17
290:25	143:19	70:4,8	212:15	23:11
295:17	158:9	101:6	217:7	78:13
312:22	159:1	153:10	220:4	97:1,10,13
337:21	162:5	161:6	242:8	,19 309:3
importantly	177:15	192:20	increased	indicating
172:18	192:18,23	203:10	79:16	51:14
176:20	193:25	222:8,9	104:4	indication
180:5	207:7,12,1	236:14	205:19	53:8
183:4	3 212:13	256:6	increases	170:24
imposition	215:3	263:2	35:14 40:6	223:11
182:25	220:21	288:5	208:6,9	indicator
246:11,12	241:19	289:6,17,2	257:5	105:13
impression	268:18	4 292:12	increasing	230:20
80:6	335:8	294:16	54:16	indicators
improbable	included	326:20	171:21	35:7 105:7
93:19	19:3 28:2	336:17	210:18	177:12,17
improve	42:19 56:1	inclusion	increasingly	273:15
209:14,17	98:25	322:9	208:7	indices
210:12,22	99:9,12	inconsistenc	incremental	177:16
211:4,5	100:20	ies 294:23	158:3	indicted
improved	118:24	inconsistenc	incubation	221:15
180:4	192:3,5	y 46:22	288:5	indirect
220:25	211:13	inconspicuou	incurred	256:1
221:1	214:10	s 74:24	114:16	individuals
improving	219:15	incorporate	independent	48:22
203:23	222:16,19	288:15	25:25	200:22
inability	247:21	293:9	160:17	342:11
190:9	326:1	incorporated	189:6	343:3
inadequacies	337:16	62:3		
	includes	291:10		
	29:14 41:3			

387				
industry	53:24	41:1	inspector	95:17
246:17	57:13		217:16	intensive
inedible	62:24 68:5	in-house	273:16	96:16
171:6,25	70:4,7,8,1	229:15	install	intent 18:17
inf 177:15	2 86:25	initial 20:4	74:21	26:17
infestation	87:9,13	174:4	installed	134:23,25
177:15	88:13	207:13	74:21,23	241:17
inflow	107:6	initially	75:4	323:8
21:1,8,10,	108:8	61:11 79:2	instance	intention
24 22:4	109:10	105:25	76:21	262:3
54:17	110:10,14,	208:4	79:11,15	292:7
97:2,21	20 112:21	initiated	279:6	295:24
157:22	118:2	162:11	instantaneous	310:13
inflows 21:5	121:5	180:6	287:11,23	intentions
80:25	135:24	195:10	instead	101:11
81:3,7	140:4,13	initiating	109:20	interacting
208:3,20	142:17	193:9	201:12	20:18
influ 105:9	145:14	initiative	219:24	interactions
influence	155:25	341:19	253:13	213:12
18:6 20:8	175:15,21	injuries	in-stream	intercept
103:22	199:10,17,	292:1	311:11	21:13
105:9	22 206:16	in-lake	instruments	interest
118:18	210:1	109:19	300:10	266:5
147:10,11	212:8	inland 84:23	intact	335:7
158:21	229:5	inlet	113:23	interested
203:20	230:8,22	311:9,12	intakes	168:17
323:10	235:14,20	input 98:24	335:8	181:2
325:1	236:16	99:16	integrated	interesting
influenced	237:23	157:12	17:10	262:19
81:3	251:6	174:4	integration	270:11
info 157:1	268:21	222:19	17:16	Interestingl
163:18	271:19,23	236:14	integrity	y 313:1
inform 17:12	279:14	inputs	167:24	interests
134:8,10	281:3	21:6,22	intend	27:11
136:3	288:19	103:12	107:22	250:16,17
139:13	294:24	117:20	152:9	294:17
147:24	310:2	147:9	intended	interfere
212:8	321:12,17	157:20	34:17	337:23
276:12	323:7	158:19	207:3	interim
279:16	326:7	insignifican	224:13	100:15
280:16	333:5	t 253:20	241:21	226:10
331:5	335:5,14,1	inspection	242:18	intermittent
information	6,19,21,22	203:11	intends	122:19
14:1 29:12	340:14	inspections		internal
31:15	informed	203:10		
51:13	250:19			
	ingestion			
	270:4			
	inherently			

388				
164:11	228:9	276:4	issues 12:6	62:23
181:22			41:9	63:1,6
international	investigation	isn't 50:15	51:16,18	65:8 68:20
1	n 268:20	78:14 97:2	78:18,22	71:15,17
246:20,21,	273:17	111:15	101:13	73:7,8,11,
24,25	invisible	172:15	147:3	13,14,24
	74:10	184:25	173:23	75:11,12
interpret	invite	251:17	191:15	76:5
148:6	265:15	257:9	195:8	77:4,5,6
269:9		279:2	227:11	80:4,6,10,
283:4	involve	307:13	229:17	14 81:20
INTERPRETATI	103:9	315:6	234:7	82:5,6,21
ON 245:23	130:4	316:3	240:18	83:4,5,17
INTERPRETED	involved	332:8	262:1	84:25 85:1
245:1	66:19	isolated	263:22	87:18
interpreters	153:12	47:24 49:7	266:2,6	88:25
343:6	180:20	89:12	272:9,19	89:23
interrupted	258:15	197:19	286:22	91:8,12,16
125:9	278:11	198:1	295:4	92:7
161:15	322:1	isolating	302:22	93:16,25
interstitial	involves	20:17	307:6	94:7
166:23	130:5	isolation	328:11	96:3,14,15
interval	ionicity	268:9	332:24	,17 97:5
290:17	82:3	issue 26:3	341:20	100:17
interven	ions 158:25	28:23 56:6	It'd 144:15	101:3
202:13	IR 31:15	58:1 59:12	item 14:2	103:18
Intervenors	84:8 85:18	75:14	items 191:23	110:7
279:25	94:17 95:9	132:3	iterations	115:4
intervention	118:12,17	176:15	106:5	116:1,2,22
204:3	145:16,17	178:15	226:8	117:18
240:4	175:22	185:20	it'll	118:15
introduce	176:11	199:25	37:15,17	121:21
15:6	277:8	201:6	40:13,25	123:12
285:12	IR-17 85:14	207:3	42:13	125:7,9,17
introduced	IR232 128:17	225:13	76:10	126:25
16:15	IR-I 94:22	227:14	118:16	128:3
intuitive	irrelevant	245:7	146:5	129:14
81:21	42:16	257:8,11,2	257:19	132:13
intuitively	IR-Round-1	3 261:24	it's 15:11	133:9,13
171:18	54:4	264:4,6	38:13,23	134:6,19
invasive	IRs 84:6	266:8,10,1	39:22	140:13,24
75:12	85:14	279:16	40:11,20	145:5
investigate	88:11	280:22	41:16,17	147:20
181:13	123:10	323:1	42:8 44:8	151:3,12
	175:21	331:23	54:16	153:7,9,15
	176:7	332:4,10	55:16	,16 154:10
	201:14	334:25	57:9,11	156:6
		issued	58:19,21	158:23
			59:6,24	159:15,24,
				25 163:7
				164:16,17

389				
173:15	297:15	Jacobsen	144:23	315:15
174:24	304:3,6,25	6:25	145:21	317:10
175:19	307:18,19,	Jaida 7:9	146:5	324:20
177:1	22 310:4	James 1:13	147:5	335:2
178:4,19	312:10,11,	Jamie 5:18	152:10	341:11,17
179:1	17	203:7	156:20	342:18
181:10	313:3,16,1	Jan 5:13	157:9,15,2	343:18
187:13	7	January	4 161:12	Jay-
191:5	314:10,12,	342:7,18	162:9	generated
196:10,18	14,20	Jar 17:6	165:15,19	168:7
201:1	315:5,8,9,	Jay 1:5 12:5	167:15,23	Jeffery 3:8
208:18	17,18	13:12	168:2,5,10	Jenkins 5:20
212:4	316:15	16:17 17:6	,23	202:22,23
214:3	317:6,7,14	18:1	169:10,11	216:22,23
216:23	,19,21,23,	20:16,19	170:7	218:1,2
217:7	24	21:1,22	177:18	219:13,14
218:2	318:6,8,9,	22:5,7,25	189:18	222:3,4
219:14,16	10,21	23:12,18	191:22	224:3,8,9
220:16	323:4	24:3 26:4	193:7,9	225:5,6
221:2,20	325:6	27:6,19	194:10	226:3,4
222:4	327:18	29:8,24	195:2,13,1	229:12,13
223:18	329:14	42:1,6,9,1	8 196:3	230:13,14
224:9	334:4	8 54:17,20	203:17	231:22,23
225:5	338:14	69:14,21	205:12	232:13,14
226:4	339:22	71:3 76:7	206:6,8	233:3,4,22
227:24	340:3	77:17	207:1,10,2	,23
228:8,15	I've 39:16	80:18	2 208:2,5,18	235:1,2
229:13	47:24	81:6,7,17	210:4,25	236:6
230:14	63:23	85:1 88:20	212:14	237:13
231:23	95:14	89:6,19	213:3,4	239:5
232:14	98:21	91:12	215:24	Jeremy 5:5
233:4,23	102:6	93:21	223:22	Jesse 4:17
235:2	121:5	95:22	229:6	Jim 3:16 4:8
236:3	156:14	97:19,21	234:19,24	JN 135:8
239:23	184:18	100:4,18	253:13	Joanne 1:10
241:14,16	196:12	103:11,24,	254:8	13:10
242:15,23	246:14	25 104:22	256:16	job 245:4
246:24	256:25	113:5,6,18	269:25	277:14
249:3	257:13	115:19	270:1	315:25
252:3	263:13	119:9,21	272:9,18	Jody 5:12
253:1	271:7	122:11,12,	278:22	John 1:15
255:8	279:7	14	287:21	2:16
256:14,22	310:5	123:7,9,11	291:8	3:15,18
257:10	312:18	,18,19	293:7,17	7:4,6
259:21	341:8	125:9	294:12	15:2,12
270:10		127:9,15	295:22	16:8,13,15
271:17		130:2,4,9,	296:4,25	
275:22	J	21 140:9	299:4	
279:17	J.F 6:17		306:25	
281:5	Jackson 5:3		314:5	
283:17				

390				
26:20,21,2	187:21	28:12,18	Kevin 7:10	296:5
2 38:22,23	231:12	86:14,16	160:18	307:15
52:15	260:12	88:15	179:21	kinds 183:7
56:10 58:7	275:14	89:15	194:5	237:8
59:17 60:9	285:5,8	90:24	key 23:16	Kirby 1:11
62:22,23	295:14,23	91:18	56:15	240:13,14
63:6 66:22	297:1	93:12	72:16	241:1,2
68:13	298:6	94:21	123:3,11,1	242:1
87:17,18	299:5	95:13,16	7 134:12	243:9
98:18	300:1	98:1,5	155:9	340:25
101:3	301:10	99:22	157:20	Klengenber
119:15	303:15	100:2	267:2,8	3:5
134:1	304:21,22	101:9	285:24	knew 165:21
149:5	306:12	102:10,13	335:1	knowledge
153:21	307:12	124:6	kill 150:14	17:5,10,11
155:4	308:12	179:8,11	165:1	,16 69:1
157:5	309:10,19	181:4	killed	70:4,13
158:17	310:12,13	221:12,15,	273:17	71:18
200:25	311:3,7,17	16	kill	290:23,24
201:1	330:12	223:15,16	kill	known 172:15
202:3	339:10	224:21	150:19	308:9
252:2,3	July 109:3	225:16	163:15	Koala 25:19
271:16,17	334:23	227:4	kilometres	130:5,7
279:17,18	jump 255:16	228:3	72:20	134:21
281:5,6	312:11	254:24	125:19	135:1,7
304:3,23	jungle	255:2,14,1	253:16	136:16
306:3	317:22	9,23	kilopascal	137:25
312:21	juvenile	256:8,25	287:13	138:15,18
316:7	172:20	262:5,15	kilopascals	139:3
340:3,18	173:6	263:13,17,	287:2,10,2	203:25
joining		23	4	206:9,11,1
14:18		274:14,17	kim 7:12	4
joke 159:15	<hr/> K <hr/>	275:1,6	138:17	213:5,8,22
jokes 76:5	Karin 5:8	297:21,24	kimberlite	214:1,2,13
Jones 8:4	Kate 2:10	298:19	25:22 83:6	,19,21,23
Joseph 7:3,5	4:11	299:13	130:6	215:1,5,9
Judas 7:3,5	Katherine	318:24	134:22	239:15
judges	4:23	325:15	135:23	Koala's
247:12	Kathy 2:13	329:20,23	136:10,15,	135:16
judgment	14:20	333:9	19,22	Kodiak
252:21	137:20	338:20,23	137:14	135:1,7,12
Julie 6:9,11	138:24	Keeleghan	138:18	,16
112:2,23	139:17	344:6	203:25	206:14,17
183:24	141:11	Kelly 4:24	206:8,9	207:14
184:15	142:24	5:4	213:4,13,1	214:3
185:8,21,2	K'e 6:2	Kemeys-Jones	5,25	Kristine
2 186:15	13:18	4:16	214:13,18	
	25:23	K'e's 324:13	239:14	

391				
3:13	112:7,9,13	234:19	93:2	288:5,12,1
kudos 318:9	118:19,23	238:23,24	96:7,19	6
Kue 25:24	119:21	252:25	105:18,22	290:7,11,1
30:1	139:25	253:25	108:17	6 291:19
116:20	140:7,14	254:1,2	109:4,12,1	298:15
120:19,24	141:14	258:19	8	307:8,16
234:11	142:1,5	263:9	110:2,14,2	308:1,19
260:18,21	145:20	264:15	1	314:4,6
277:19	147:12	266:20	111:12,13	317:20
301:2	150:11	268:3	112:7	324:3
319:22	153:4	287:4	113:17	327:9,11
320:24	156:8,13,1	289:1,25	114:3	lakes 11:18
328:2	8	290:8,21,2	123:13	34:25 44:7
329:23	157:11,13,	2 291:23	129:18	48:4,20
339:16	17,18,20,2	292:15,21,	131:8,13	49:7 71:25
K'ue 125:7	3,25	22 293:20	135:1,12,1	72:9
188:5	158:3,10	294:5	6 137:13	73:4,16,25
326:10	159:4,5	296:2,14	146:3,12	75:16
	162:16,19	297:4	150:13	76:20 78:5
	163:7	305:21,22	151:7	79:13
	164:20	306:24	152:5,24	81:1,4,5
<hr/> L <hr/>	165:7	323:18	164:7	82:20
lab 38:20	166:7	335:9	165:8	86:22
laboratory	168:15,24	340:5,12,1	166:9,15,1	87:1,22
169:19	169:20	5	6,20	88:5,16
Lac 18:1,2,8	170:1,3	lack 65:13	167:11,13,	89:12 90:6
20:18,21	171:13	181:19	16,19,22	122:10
22:20 24:8	172:17	228:15	168:3,7,11	123:13,14
27:6,13	177:6,7	267:1	,12,13,14,	129:24,25
28:5,6	187:3,4,13	lake 19:3	19	155:17
31:10	190:22,23	28:6,20	172:8,20	164:4,24
34:21	193:18	29:14,21,2	190:20	167:11
42:2,16	194:1	3	196:19,20	168:5,18
44:12	196:4	31:21,22,2	197:19	169:19
46:23	197:4,12,1	3,24 32:1	198:1	171:1
47:1,2,5,1	7,20 198:1	33:9,11	199:12,14	172:6
6,19,23	204:9,10,1	39:21	206:12,14,	186:20,25
48:6,19,24	8,23,25	40:3,5,6,8	17	187:3
,25 49:5,9	205:4,6,22	,9,25	207:14,20	190:14
54:24	206:2,23	41:25	212:16,20	206:14,23
69:3,4,10	207:13,18,	42:5,6,12	214:3	214:10,23
71:6,7,9,1	20	48:21,22	223:17	215:10
3,14,22	208:1,13	71:8	245:17	223:8
72:4,5,15,	209:10	73:11,18	253:3	256:10,12,
18 97:4	210:13	76:21	256:21,22	24 307:10
99:12,13	211:11,12,	79:14	258:18	308:7
104:24	23 217:23	89:7,10	264:19	310:11
106:1	220:11,24,	90:9,13	266:13	314:21
107:4	25 229:8	91:21	276:7	325:12
108:17	230:23	92:1,7	284:2	lake's
	231:2		287:19	

392				
314:25	164:6,20	82:10	Lawrence	328:9
lakeward	178:19	108:13	81:2	leaves 216:4
217:21	184:7,13	109:2	122:17	Lee 2:22
land 25:13	204:7	110:16	laws	44:22 46:6
26:11,15	205:2	126:2,23	246:11,17,	74:19
27:1 29:18	256:21	138:4	21	75:21,22
35:9,25	258:18	139:1	lay 80:4	107:13
89:3,8	301:17	172:3	166:24	108:23
95:17	309:7	193:11	layer 23:10	109:24
100:18	322:9	208:14	90:11,13	111:10
102:14	325:23	214:24	97:12	120:9
144:9,18	326:17	227:12	146:8,11	126:13
162:3,8	large-bodied	246:7	323:19	135:5,21
163:1	105:14	251:13	layers 23:11	136:5
180:6,21	106:13	267:23	146:15	137:2,16
193:8	107:2	269:17	325:9	143:17
195:9	185:24	273:3	lead 46:1,10	legacy 316:9
198:11,15	186:4,21	279:22	161:18	legal 38:21
229:17	187:18	317:25	174:16	62:21
246:5,6	largely 79:6	341:2	285:14	87:16
247:6	138:12,13	lastly	298:11	152:16
248:17	larger 28:2	153:13	326:21	200:22,23
249:3	42:2 71:7	lasts 191:5	leader 328:4	203:10
250:7,12	72:17	lat 42:15	leaders	251:24
253:11	91:25 92:7	late 106:4	124:15	252:17
254:4,6	103:12	196:11	249:24,25	271:15
269:22	104:20	later 16:5	leads 152:12	320:19
332:5	105:16,17	84:9 143:2	learn 138:3	legislation
landing	163:10,13	210:9,11	learned	246:18
271:3	165:5	211:16	152:10	247:9
lands	198:1	220:4,20	167:14	335:1
248:4,23	204:10,24	267:9,16	219:1	length 39:20
249:24	256:22	281:24	246:7	42:16
270:3	292:16	lateral	least 71:18	63:18 64:4
342:9,20,2	326:24	146:23	143:11	125:19,23,
1	larger-	laterally	166:6	24 154:12
language	bodied	317:6	179:25	lengths 26:4
18:19 76:2	105:16	latter 80:24	180:16	314:8
244:25	largest	157:14	195:19	318:5
245:1	263:22	launch	199:12,14,	lengthy
246:4	laser 255:17	273:17	23 258:7	95:11
248:21	last 13:21	Laura	264:7	Les 4:6
languages	15:16 19:8	3:2,10,11	leave 97:21	Leslie
248:19	22:21	law 80:11	140:3	206:11
large 31:22	36:22	246:19,20,	146:25	207:14
72:18	37:12,13	21,25	327:9	less 19:6
73:10	45:13			
163:16	70:16			

393				
22:16 25:6	li 53:4	80:20	lined	little
47:3 62:4	liabilities	85:19	244:3,4	37:16,18,2
78:1 91:23	232:15	210:22	lines	4 38:13
123:8	liability	211:6	21:10,13	83:5 84:23
124:2	231:19	likely 48:21	23:5,7	120:24
171:6	232:20	60:20	59:25	124:2
212:23	233:11	71:23,24,2	108:6	133:17
238:23	234:3	5 73:4,12	138:14,15	140:4,13
243:5	licence	94:7 106:2	link 54:13	156:22
322:3,13	29:17	150:7	274:4	194:7
lessons	30:6,15	162:14	linked	199:25
152:10	31:1 33:20	169:24	273:25	212:10
let's 83:3,8	35:10 46:9	193:21	liquids 80:8	232:2
93:17	50:5	208:14	Lisa 4:2,4	242:7
250:8	137:10	217:7	list 9:3	283:18,24
letter	144:10	234:20	10:24	284:8
246:8,9	148:10	291:17	11:25	309:6
letting	licensing	303:13	18:15 19:9	317:22
74:11	149:14	305:9	54:1,5	328:20
level 27:15	207:5	Lim 7:14	55:18	live 163:21
40:6,10	218:14	limit 31:25	78:15,17	164:6,25
45:22 48:3	249:4	61:9 178:8	88:10	165:2
54:14	lien 249:21	287:10	168:18	246:19
73:22	liens 249:19	303:7	201:3	livelihoods
74:7,14	250:22	limitations	337:22	256:4
170:15	lies 48:16	296:11	listed 88:16	liver 164:11
171:13	53:5 61:6	limited	292:11	living 187:1
186:10	249:17	47:19 48:7	listening	245:11
216:10	life 25:3	86:7 180:2	16:4 259:6	LKDFN 9:19
263:9	43:25 73:9	197:24	lists 337:22	179:12
307:20	94:25	206:5,15	literally	255:11
322:11,22	104:24	208:16	167:3	256:9
327:6	127:12,13	214:14	literature	264:17
levels 28:2	163:19	244:20	32:2 72:23	319:1
33:16	164:1,4	limiting	105:20	LLCF 172:7
49:5,23,24	168:24	241:19	117:7	206:11
74:20	169:7	308:18	199:9	loading
76:14,19	208:21	Linaker 4:19	litre	163:19
77:11,12,1	210:9,11,1	line 39:9	205:10,14	284:6
4,16	3 220:21	51:12	209:4,6	loadings
79:10,14	250:5	116:24	212:24	220:25
97:3 168:3	256:5	121:4	242:20	loads 184:3
170:21	288:17,18	137:6	243:6	local 27:20
184:21	289:11	225:16	266:12	28:2
263:1	light 318:3	239:20	282:25	178:9,22,2
290:5,7	likelihood	302:25	327:8	3 204:8
291:3,17	23:18	321:7		205:6
303:23				

394				
206:7,22	199:1	306:8	,23	224:20
207:12	223:18	lot 41:9	23:5,9,10,	225:16
209:7	225:22	52:19	15 24:1	227:4
216:2	257:12	57:13	60:22	228:3
290:23	258:1,23	72:14 73:1	61:4,20	254:24
325:3	285:11	77:23	62:5,18	255:1,14,1
338:9	334:5	95:20	63:20	9,23
localized	339:22	112:10	64:11,15	256:8,25
178:7	longer 24:13	117:25	81:20	262:4,15
204:12,17	39:23 42:4	118:2	90:14	263:13,17,
205:20	96:17	124:9	94:11	23
206:2	102:18	171:16	97:3,6,10	274:14,16,
207:4,8	171:14	184:25	118:4	25 275:5
local-scale	191:9	185:1	126:20	297:21,23
106:1	longevity	190:21,23	146:14	298:18
locate 84:6	307:11	200:21	159:25	299:13
located	longstanding	217:14	160:1	318:24
166:17	179:24	226:22	184:12	324:13
287:20	long-term	276:3	301:24	325:15
location	96:19	297:5	lower-bound	329:20,22
54:1	97:22	312:15,16	148:17	331:23
120:13	129:16	316:8	lowering	333:8
298:14	209:19	328:19	54:14	338:20,22
locations	212:22	lots 72:15	Lukus 3:3	Lynda 5:21
18:9 71:8	220:10	146:22	lunch	Lynn 3:6
110:17	221:17	332:24	129:5,12	Lynx
118:24	242:19	loud 343:10	Lutsel 6:2	54:13,14
146:2	258:22	love 102:17	13:18	55:25
147:12	313:22	263:16	25:23	152:5
223:9	loose 200:2	low 74:24	28:12,18	161:6
291:4	Loretta 6:19	75:12	86:14,15	299:11
Lockhart	Lorraine	76:14	88:14	
223:9	3:24	77:15	89:15	<hr/> M <hr/>
logistical	loss 115:2	85:18,19	90:24	MacDonald
60:4	256:4	91:21	91:18	8:11
long 14:25	298:12	106:15	93:12	127:5,6
15:7 42:4	303:25	159:25	94:21	128:1,19
61:21 62:6	304:8	170:14	95:13,16	188:10
63:4 64:10	305:4,5	255:20	98:1,5	201:2,4
90:22	losses	257:4	99:22	234:17
96:7,18	114:16,17	288:18	100:2	235:25
97:15,16	304:13	291:6	101:9	236:24
98:8 100:5	327:18	310:7	102:10,13	238:3,4
137:12	lost 240:22	lower 11:7	124:6	MacKay 4:5
164:6	295:21	19:18	179:8,10	mackenzie
172:7	296:2,3,8,	20:1,2	181:4	1:2 6:23
191:4	17 305:9	21:11,19,2	221:12,14,	102:24
		0	16	260:4
		22:8,17,19	223:15,16	

395				
265:12	200:25	340:19	257:22	160:20
275:10	201:10,20	Madame	majority	161:9,16
298:23	202:3,14,2	118:14	35:17	162:2,18,2
299:20	3 203:18	magnesium	makers	3 164:9,13
300:17	206:18	326:21	280:16	169:2
Mackenzie	207:15	magnitude	Malone 3:11	173:22
1:9 13:11	211:25	205:5	man 245:20	174:10,13,17
102:24	212:25	Mahoney 5:4	248:16	175:1,2,8
181:16	215:13,20	main 35:2	manage 59:4	179:17
228:12	216:22	121:4	78:12	180:8,23
250:3	218:1	123:16	141:5	181:16
260:4	219:13	204:1	208:2,23	191:21,25
265:13	220:15	206:6,24	managed	192:19,25
275:10	222:3	213:2	207:22	193:4
298:23	224:8	327:19	211:15	195:4,11
300:17	226:3	mainly	324:1	196:8
MacPherson	227:8,9,22	285:24	management	208:17
2:20	228:15	maintain	19:1 20:15	209:16
Madam 14:23	229:12	40:9	24:16	210:15
15:10	230:2,13	48:17,20	26:9,16	211:20
16:14	231:5,22	54:7,11	28:14,15,1	216:12
17:20 24:5	232:13	55:11 78:4	9 29:11,16	217:2,9
26:22 31:7	233:3,22	103:13	32:5,15	228:12
33:1 35:10	235:1	190:19	33:16	241:20,22
36:6 38:22	236:6	206:21	43:10 50:1	254:10
39:9 43:4	237:13	285:21	51:14,17,2	258:21
48:11	238:3	322:11,14	0,25	268:19
49:3,15	239:5,22	maintained	52:2,18	276:13
50:21,24	240:14	31:23	55:10	289:3
52:10,15	243:11	211:7	56:20	301:8
55:1,15	252:3,16	223:22	57:3,5,15,23	310:15
57:8	253:22	233:11	58:17,22	336:17
59:5,23	259:17,20	240:4	59:9 60:12	manager
61:17	265:4	maintaining	61:24	50:25
62:22 63:7	268:22	79:6	78:11,21	203:3
65:7 68:19	269:4	266:13	80:21	285:9
84:3 85:23	270:9	310:17	81:5,16	334:14
87:17	271:16	322:7	91:15	managing
113:2	280:6	324:11	117:21	59:19
116:22	281:5,12	maintenance	131:7,10	208:20
154:6,23	282:4,8	263:25	134:8	213:25
160:16	285:7	289:10	137:14	268:5
173:14	297:14	major 158:25	139:19	mandate
174:23	306:14	169:18	141:22,23	176:13
175:13	308:24	172:6,11	148:9,19,2	275:23
177:22	318:20	180:6	2,25	285:16,20
178:3,25	321:2		158:6,22	303:19
181:8	328:1,15			304:2
182:9,14	329:13			
183:17	334:12			
	338:13			

396				
332:5	243:9	19:21	336:8	298:12
Mansfield	Marty 4:25	24:24 25:6	maybe 78:3	311:4
2:10	Masi 329:3,6	31:11	198:17	326:15
map 308:2,14	343:19	39:14 42:5	232:2	meaning
Marc 7:21	mask 204:17	43:25	241:7	249:15
116:21,22	Mason 3:13	45:8,25	279:2	meaningful
119:3,16	mass	49:3 69:17	312:24	327:17
120:1,14	21:6,8,10	73:23 74:5	328:20	means 255:9
126:25	89:8	77:3 93:19	mayor 328:3	300:9
188:6	247:18	99:25	McKay 8:8	meant 241:9
234:13	massed	100:1	188:14,15	262:9
260:20	163:19	106:12	McManus 2:11	meantime
277:20	masterpiece	107:4	McMillan	143:3
301:4	257:7	110:12	183:20,21	measurable
302:1	material	117:13	265:21,22	47:13
319:24	159:4	130:20	McMillian	measure
321:2,3	184:25	137:5	6:15	24:23
326:13	185:16	138:14	Meagan 6:16	25:16
327:21	252:4	162:16	103:3	27:19,21
331:20	341:25	163:19,20	104:6,19	43:9,12,13
332:2,18	342:16,23	165:13	106:24	,21 55:8
339:18	materials	170:7,9	108:11,12	74:20
Marc's	201:9	178:8,21	109:16	161:24
120:24	311:2,4,5,	180:11	111:2,22	164:19
Marentette	14	190:16	231:8	168:9
6:11	mathematical	191:7	260:8	178:8
Marjorie	174:3	204:16	265:24,25	193:20
6:22	mathematicia	206:9	269:14	207:7
319:6,7	ns 312:22	217:6,8,20	274:3,21	211:13
330:3,4	Matheson-	230:3	275:2	212:6,13
339:2	Maund 6:22	244:16,18	283:12,14	215:3
Mark 2:3	319:6,7	261:14,25	319:11	241:17,19
6:12 14:16	330:3,4	270:6	330:8	242:18
63:9,11	339:2,3	273:4	mean 59:1	283:4
66:25 67:1	matter 18:22	279:2	73:20,24	322:25
200:7	57:11	281:6	85:19	323:11,12,
271:24	249:2	284:25	90:25	17 325:21
278:15	matters	287:8	92:15	326:1,4
303:3	252:5	288:6	101:4	measured
306:14,15	maximum	289:19	102:12	164:12
320:17	34:17	292:25	124:8	283:8
333:19	150:14	293:12	140:22	330:21
Marshall	165:20	298:12	153:7	measurement
1:11	may 18:22	300:9	156:24	35:6
240:14		301:19	197:3	105:7,13
241:1,2		303:16	262:7	177:11,17
242:1		310:6	264:17	measurements
		333:9	281:19	
		334:25		
		335:1		

397				
283:5	242:23	248:24	326:18	123:17
measures	298:25	memory	mero 117:10	129:17
100:9	meeting	125:11	213:9	144:22
182:19	13:21 99:5	mention	meromi 324:6	161:10,11,
183:1,7,11	109:9	286:16	meromictic	14 162:13
193:20	134:13	334:2	11:18 78:5	210:22
240:19	136:4	mentioned	79:12	213:9
258:22	235:23	11:19 74:2	82:20	219:3,4
262:16	244:2	81:1,2	84:16	221:18
268:14	meetings	87:23 88:7	87:22 88:5	223:21
290:13	264:2	89:4	117:5,10,1	224:15,23
293:4	300:14	95:14,16	4	225:11
294:19	302:21	105:15	121:1,7,9,	232:7,16
305:10	meets	106:25	14 122:18	255:16
322:18	113:13,14	108:3	123:24	274:19
327:23	128:3	111:16	131:8	275:20
measuring	136:20	117:9	161:14	313:21,25
75:17	336:16	119:6	211:24	314:1
meat 194:7	Melissa 4:9	139:23	220:6	315:4
mechanical	melt 69:5	153:3	314:4	message
161:7	313:24	155:14	315:20	48:13
mechanism	melts 79:21	174:25	324:4,7,20	253:20
26:17	member	179:11,12	325:7,12,1	met 200:22
133:4	1:11,12,13	189:16	9 327:14	222:13
153:8,16	,14,15	195:6	331:25	223:1
298:3	8:18	225:18	meromix	232:18,23
mechanisms	155:25	232:1	225:11	233:8
102:1	156:10	247:8	meromixes	235:6
med 42:19	252:15,20	258:13	314:21	MET4 122:7
median 151:5	259:4	295:15	315:1	metal 185:19
283:5	263:15	297:24	meromixis	metals 159:3
284:4	members	Menzies 2:9	19:24	164:10
meet 26:17	14:15	mer 232:16	20:1,12,16	185:13
30:4 37:25	153:20	Mercredi	23:1,11,18	325:24
38:1 54:21	200:11	5:11 8:6	24:3 25:25	326:20
101:5	240:13	mercury	26:3 39:15	metasediment
102:3	244:15,18	28:20,23	78:25	s 62:2
119:24	252:9	37:1	80:3,20,22	methane
130:10,19	265:5	156:24	81:21,23	156:24
131:2,5,12	285:7	163:23	82:2	method 77:25
,16,24	306:18	164:8,11	86:22,23	185:20
134:23	320:21	184:20,21	90:4,19,21	195:3
138:13	328:18	185:6,18	91:10,14,1	196:5
147:5	333:23	257:23	9	301:12
214:17,22	340:2,21	259:1	92:1,4,9,1	309:13
215:8	343:11	261:22	7 94:13	methodologic
239:18	membership	262:1,7,9,	96:12	al 169:15
		13 274:2	117:22,25	
			118:1,6,11	

398				
methodology	24 308:15	millennia	158:5	207:8
185:4	mic 14:19	95:23 98:9	160:20	minimizing
methods	163:2	milligrams	162:1,23	32:11
213:24	MICHAEL	165:21,25	164:10	158:8
Metis 8:3,8	17:19	205:9,14	165:7,16	minimum
113:1,3	18:13	209:3,6	169:4	18:19
114:5,21	40:20 42:8	212:24	170:12	mining 20:19
115:21	80:14	242:20	185:10	104:22
116:5,17	88:25	243:5	187:23	167:14
128:25	89:23 91:8	266:12	191:20	209:12
188:1,3,13	93:25 96:3	282:25	192:19,21,	213:3,6
231:15,17	103:18	327:8	25 194:20	270:13
232:6,22	117:18	millimetres	195:5	316:2
233:16	121:21	288:4	207:11	Minister
234:10	145:5	million	210:9,11,1	342:9,19,2
238:6	mics 156:9	54:10	3 211:22	1
252:7,18	mid-1990s	mimic 301:18	212:14	minor 293:22
253:1,4,20	69:2	mind 250:18	213:5	minute 86:8
260:15,17,	midge 126:7	300:2	217:16	191:5
25	migrate	329:2	220:21	200:13
275:17,19	73:24	minds 100:10	221:21	224:4
276:15,25	290:21	195:19	223:10	243:15,22
277:17,22	migrating	mindset	232:8	284:19
300:24	253:6	328:6	253:17	minutes 66:2
301:1	migratory	mine 19:1	254:2	154:16
302:9	12:8 32:24	20:17	257:3	244:21
319:19,21	269:19,20,	22:14	258:24	303:16
320:2	22 270:7	24:12	326:3	Misery 11:8
331:8,10,1	271:1	25:3,12	mined 203:25	12:5
3	272:10,21	26:23	mined-out	20:8,17
339:13,15,	273:7,10	27:4,8	136:19	22:10,20,2
21	278:24,25	28:10	mines 32:3	5 23:12,18
metre 159:23	Mike 3:21	29:21,23	91:15	24:4,8,19,
160:4	5:24	30:2,3,5,1	121:5	22 25:2
166:10	15:1,23	2,24 43:10	229:6	26:4 28:5
metres 25:6	16:19	44:8 52:4	328:8,9	30:5 42:1
42:12	17:18,20	54:15,17,1	mine's 258:3	52:4,20
54:10 89:6	26:21	8,23	Mines 8:12	53:10
97:5	40:20 42:8	56:11,12,2	127:4	54:7,12
125:23	80:14	0 60:16	188:9	55:25
154:12,13	88:25	61:13	234:16	56:17,21
160:5	89:23 91:8	78:11,21	minimize	58:12
166:7	93:25 96:3	86:23	152:18	59:19
212:17	103:18	91:14,20	207:7	60:16,20,2
214:4	117:18	99:24,25	minimized	5 61:2
242:6	121:21	121:3,4	290:25	62:7,19
253:15,16	145:5	139:19	minimizes	64:6,11
287:20		141:22	27:19	80:18 81:8
307:20,22,				

399				
84:25 97:1	mitigate	79:3,17	219:6,7,15	141:19
103:6,10,1	32:18	85:3	268:19	142:3,14,1
2,14	151:23	123:21	276:10	7 149:17
129:18	183:8	169:7	277:2,11,1	157:6
130:3,5	237:1	170:1	2 312:25	198:18
131:6,13,1	287:12	207:13	314:8,20	219:1
4 132:22	289:4	241:22	modeling	220:18
133:21,22	290:13	255:22	274:23	224:17
134:5,15	291:18	257:9	modelled	243:7
137:23	mitigated	269:7,18,2	21:5 22:6	267:25
139:25	51:15	2,24	23:25	312:15,17
143:5	294:8	270:3,8,18	39:18	313:13
144:23	304:18	278:22,23	81:18	318:6,7,8
145:21	306:8	324:22	90:3,18	324:8
157:13,22	mitigating	325:4	104:5	models
161:6,12	33:8 53:22	mixolimnion	141:1,7,15	19:13,17
203:22,23	287:3,17	90:10,14	modeller	22:25
207:16,17,	mitigation	103:25	277:9	80:19
19,23,24,2	24:24	104:3	modellers	82:11
5	26:25 32:7	123:4	277:7	85:21
208:2,8,12	51:15	212:23	modelling	92:23 93:5
,24	193:20	mobile 34:24	15:22,24	96:6 99:14
209:18,19,	216:5	model 17:25	16:23	117:6
23,24	268:7	19:2,4,9,1	18:15 19:8	124:10
210:2,7,23	287:8	0,15,16	20:5,13,25	140:6,7
,25	288:2	20:3	22:22,24	142:15
211:1,4,14	289:17	21:16,23	23:14,17,2	148:8,13
,22	291:14	22:2,10	0 25:7	274:18,23,
212:14,16,	293:4,7	31:9	26:7 28:1	24
19 219:24	294:19	40:15,23	35:13	modern
220:3,6,9	295:5	41:2	40:22	248:7,23
242:24	304:19	76:3,13	41:23	249:7
267:24	mitigations	82:4,6,10,	42:19 53:8	modes 11:13
268:1,3,6,	218:6,16	13,18	60:19	66:9
12,16,21	mix 95:22	90:17 91:1	78:13	67:10,20
270:1	213:17,19	92:8,21	80:17	modification
271:3	255:18	93:13	81:10,12,1	209:16
272:9,18	257:19	96:8,10,11	4 93:5	modify 77:10
278:21	mixed 84:22	,21,25	97:13,18	modifying
324:20	118:19	97:9 99:11	99:1	11:14
misinterpret	146:5	117:12,21	103:20	67:11
ation	232:24	118:18	104:2	68:12,15
119:17	mixes 231:20	121:13	117:5,19,2	moment 92:5
missed 84:12	232:1	147:3,8,9	2	280:4,5
341:8	313:25	148:11,14,	118:3,10,2	321:5
mistake	mixing 28:4	15,16,17,2	0	Monica 4:10
39:11	40:14 41:4	3 149:7	124:21,22	monimolimnio
misunderstood 178:14	44:1	167:7	133:5	
		174:2,13,1	140:5	
		9 198:15		

400				
n 123:5	147:23	329:7,8	212:25	145:15
monitor	148:3,5,20	337:3,5	218:12	myself 51:7
52:22	160:17	monkeys	222:6	246:15
58:11	161:1,10	257:6	251:18	277:9
74:7,14	162:5,12	monoring	254:22	328:4,21
77:11,12	163:5,9	32:22	moved 55:25	
223:5,6,7,	164:4	Monte 19:9	123:19	<hr/>
8 243:7	165:5	20:24 22:2	233:12	<hr/> N <hr/>
monitored	167:12,18	76:5	323:4	name's
57:25	169:1	312:25	movement	149:25
291:3	174:1,7,9	mor 58:25	72:9 73:15	Nancy 5:7
324:1	175:1,6	morning	113:15	nar 73:2
monitoring	176:5	13:3,9,20	325:8	narrative
17:22	178:13	14:15,22,2	moves 79:22	263:10
24:14	179:15	4	moving 43:22	narrow
25:10	180:2,10,2	16:3,5,14	73:2,6	125:20
26:25	4 184:14	17:19 89:4	79:10,13	narrows
27:9,15	191:2	111:17	93:16	33:9,12
28:10	192:2,14	122:25	130:4	48:3 49:6
29:14	193:2	139:18	134:20	69:13
30:5,8,20,	194:6	144:2,20	149:8	72:25
22 32:7,22	195:24	145:11	155:12	73:1,2,3,6
33:11,13	215:18,20	150:3	212:7	75:4,16
34:15	219:20	158:5	216:25	77:3,16
35:3,5,20	221:4,22,2	161:8	224:18	112:12
36:12,16	3 222:12	256:10	226:8,10	153:24,25
38:5 39:10	223:2,12	266:5,19	229:24	155:9,12,1
44:25	229:18,20	mortality	257:21	8 190:9,15
45:13	230:18	292:1	314:4	290:20
46:8,21	235:19	323:5	multiple	291:5,20
49:21	236:3,13	mostly	11:11	322:23
52:19	243:7	172:20	65:15	Nat 322:3
53:12	254:9	285:25	67:7,19	Nathan 179:1
58:13 59:8	259:15	mouth 306:6	93:5	Nathen 5:23
60:15 74:3	266:18,25	mouthful	124:10,11,	50:24,25
99:4	267:14	82:25	12	55:15,16
101:24	268:18	move 48:22	muscle	57:8,9
105:6,11,2	269:2	59:24	164:11,25	59:5,6,23,
4,25 106:3	271:4	71:24	mutually	24 61:17
107:21	276:5,7,17	72:18,19,2	27:8	63:1,2
108:15,25	,21 283:25	0 73:4	147:22	65:7,8
109:15	287:9	98:2	230:17	68:19,20
110:5	288:2	112:11	MVEIRB 2:2	173:14,15
111:18,20	289:10	147:1	25:16	174:23,24
126:16	290:11,12,	155:16	81:13	175:13,19
136:2	15,18	190:9,14	118:17	177:22
137:7	291:10,11	201:21	128:17	178:3,4,25
139:21	294:20			203:2
143:21	295:11			
144:3,7	318:15,16,			
	17 324:21			

401				
220:15,16	312:1,6,8	335:2,18,2	Neumann	nor 166:16
239:22,23	318:25	4,25	312:21	normally
241:13,14	319:23	337:6,18,2	316:8	169:20
242:15,16	328:2	3 340:5,12	Newfoundland	279:19
259:20,21	329:17,21,	nearby 31:17	187:1	North 8:3
297:14,15	23 331:24	193:25	nicely 82:24	75:10 90:1
318:20,21	333:9	nearly	Nichol 3:7	105:24
329:13,14	338:17,21,	207:25	nick 326:21	112:25
338:13,14	23 339:17	necessarily	nickel	113:3
Nathen's	Nations	59:1	326:21	114:4,21
63:22	88:15	122:12	Nicole 3:4	115:20
Nation 6:3	116:20	139:3	night 82:10	116:4,16
25:23,24	221:13	140:12	nine 309:3	187:25
28:12,13,1	274:11	277:1	noble 163:17	188:2
9 30:1	320:24	necessary	Nobody 251:8	231:14,16
68:23	327:3	24:17 26:1	nodding	232:5,21
86:14,16	Nation's	54:25 57:1	63:22	233:15
89:15	325:15	149:17	Noeline 8:17	234:9
90:24	NATIONS	183:1	244:12,23	252:17
91:18	245:1	268:9	245:3,25	253:1
93:12	natural 51:2	290:13	247:1	260:14,16
94:21	113:16	necessitate	251:10	275:16,18
95:13,17	146:11	45:23	non 75:1	276:14,24
98:1 99:22	167:13	negatively	non-	277:17
101:9	170:3,5	291:9	colourful	287:10
102:11	173:16	negligible	75:1	300:23,25
124:7	174:6	152:2	none 123:13	307:10
144:20	175:20	Neil 2:14	166:11	316:3
179:4,6,9,	203:1,14	5:17 14:20	202:4	319:18,20
11 181:4	241:15	143:25	215:22	331:7,9
188:5	288:25	144:16	304:2	339:12,14
221:8,10,1	289:24	146:19	non-lethal	northeast
5 223:15	290:9	147:19	106:12	69:12
224:21	322:4,14	148:1,7	164:20	287:20
225:16	naturally	149:6,23	184:18	northern
227:4	164:7	196:16	325:22	184:22
234:12	167:8	197:2,6,7	non-	288:17
254:24	209:7	198:8,25	measurable	334:15,18
255:2,14,2	nature 74:6	200:5	31:18	Northwest
3 257:1	227:2	203:6	non-	15:21
259:24	327:11	282:22	potentiall	50:23
260:19,21	navigability	283:16,23	y 194:13	76:16
262:5,16	340:15	284:10		173:13,16
263:13	navigable	net 97:19		202:16,18,
274:15,17	337:7,9,15	network		25 203:13
275:1,6	,22	88:20		216:9
277:19	navigation			247:7,14,2
297:18,22,				3
24 298:19				248:3,10,2
301:3				

402				
5 249:22	nothing	NWT's 43:24	101:6	151:21
250:13	85:20		217:5	183:23,25
258:6	226:16	<hr/>	218:18	184:16
259:19	317:18	<hr/> O <hr/>	235:20	185:22
273:22	notice 39:18	objection	occupy	187:22
297:13	249:7	201:22,25	105:17	231:11,13
318:19	noticed	objective	occur 22:5	260:11,13
329:12	43:23	35:3	23:23	275:13,15
338:12	44:12 75:7	163:17	30:14 31:1	284:25
Norwegian	332:1	objectively	35:9 41:25	285:3,11,1
1:14	np	317:15	92:25 94:7	4,20
156:5,6,10	3:15,16,19	objectives	105:18	287:14,15,
158:11	,25	34:22	106:2	22 288:11
159:6	4:2,3,4,5,	101:5	107:18	289:2,8,13
308:24,25	6,7,8,10,1	104:12	145:1	,14,22
309:15,16	3,14,15,16	129:21	161:12	290:6,10
310:3,4,23	,17,18,19,	130:10,18	165:10	291:2,13,1
,24	21,22,23,2	131:2,3,5,	172:17	6
311:6,15,2	4,25	13,16,24	199:20	292:6,9,17
0	5:3,4,5,7,	133:20	208:14	293:5,15,2
Nory 3:3	8,9,10,11,	134:14,21,	236:23	4
notably	12,13,21,2	24 135:14	237:9	294:3,14,2
285:25	2 6:24,25	136:4,20	255:22	2,25
notches	7:4,9,12,1	138:2,12,1	256:2	295:19,24
113:14	3 8:4,5,6	4 147:6	258:11	296:22
note 18:17	NSMA 231:24	193:22	291:17	297:2
51:19	252:4	209:9	292:25	298:7
57:17	263:6,23	211:6	309:8	299:6
83:20	317:8	214:9,17,2	325:5	300:2
87:13	NT 1:23	2 215:9	occurred	301:6,11
111:14	nuclear	222:13,14,	37:13	303:16
116:15	313:2	15,23,25	91:11	304:22
147:20	numerous	232:18,23	194:19	306:13
165:3	47:3 297:3	233:7,10	197:8	307:13
166:5	nutrient	235:6,12,2	occurring	308:13
170:20	171:12	3 236:12	21:6 46:1	309:11,20
206:4	nutrificatio	239:18	48:19 92:2	310:12
214:11	n 172:13	240:3	94:4	311:4
248:22	nutrition	241:23	113:25	319:14,17
292:10	171:5	242:23	144:7	330:11,13
295:1	NWT 43:9,11	observations	209:7	339:9,11
317:5	165:4	325:13	230:23	Oct 202:12
noted 57:13	217:15,19	obstructed	299:3	October 11:4
107:2	NWT-IR-204	190:15	occurs 49:8	38:3,18
288:11	43:24	obtain	94:3 132:8	39:6
notes 166:6		163:17	157:14	202:12
211:3		obviously	Oceans 6:9	273:2
287:15		38:14	10:3	281:14,16
		75:13	112:1,3,24	341:18
				342:4,5,6

403				
offer 100:8	45:12	266:14	90:9	22:21
233:13	83:24	274:1	oper 55:9	23:24
office 309:2	151:12	327:9	operate	25:18 30:7
336:10	156:8	onerous	237:19	51:18
officer	233:18	315:13,14	operating	52:20
334:17	285:6	ones 51:5	73:17	54:8,13,19
official	Ohokannoak	171:6	192:22	56:11,12
341:25	7:9	245:11	237:18	57:17,25
officially	oil 80:9	256:18	operation	106:4
343:19	82:1	264:14	22:11	134:4
offset	270:14	302:18	29:2,24	147:5
115:8,21	271:9	303:12	30:12,18,2	157:21
151:25	okay 15:8	one's 322:21	4 53:13	180:17
152:8	49:18	ongoing	99:3	193:9
254:10	63:24 65:5	29:20,22	110:18	206:15
296:2,19	68:8 77:19	105:10	135:8	207:17,22
302:4	86:4	109:14	157:15,16	208:11,15,
304:6	118:15	180:21	195:25	22
305:11	119:4	243:7	206:25	209:13,15,
322:18	120:15,22	268:18	207:9	18,23
off-set	125:1,25	276:6	210:3	210:7,16,2
323:10	126:17	285:22	217:3	4 211:12
offsetting	129:5,11	online	operational	217:17
33:23 34:4	155:4	130:21	22:14,19	230:25
114:17	160:6	onsite	24:13	231:3
115:17	185:21	299:15	25:10 28:9	263:11
116:2,12,1	200:12	onto 43:6,23	29:7 32:22	270:13
5	202:17	onus 222:24	52:19	opinion
151:22,24	219:16	235:4	53:12,15	28:22
152:14,17	222:22	Onwards	55:9 60:15	190:10
153:6	240:12	170:6	98:25	257:10
293:2,4,7	243:13	open 63:19	111:18	263:8
294:6,9,21	250:8	73:7 74:3	134:3,10	283:3,21
295:14,20	254:22	290:16	136:2	opinions
296:15	255:12	291:5	137:7,9	342:13
298:9	262:18	299:2	139:21	opportunitie
299:1,3,12	265:9,14	301:19	141:4	s 17:15
,23,24	269:1	322:2	144:3	256:4
300:3	281:11	326:6	149:16	296:2
302:19	284:24	opened	212:8	300:14
303:12	285:6	113:15	215:6	opportunity
304:7	316:11	opening	218:13	46:16
305:15,18,	O'Keefe 2:24	13:18,21,2	operationall	52:21
20 306:2	older 163:20	4 244:2	y 55:13	58:21
327:18	oligotrophic	open-pit	58:11	163:24
331:5	27:13		operations	201:14
341:16,18	171:14		18:5	240:6
oh 39:9			20:9,22	280:2
				281:11

404				
334:20	174:20	204:9	94:12,16	138:15,18
opposed	186:7,9	311:9,12	118:9	139:3
43:13	208:1	outline	145:11,13	203:25
66:16	211:9	107:17	146:4	206:9,10,1
310:11	214:21,25	outlined	overturned	4 213:5,22
opposite	297:9	53:23	119:2	214:1,2,13
40:8	ore 29:11	240:1,4	122:23	,18,21,23
optimal 25:5	206:8	outputs	145:19,21,	215:1,5,9
197:21	O'Reilly	174:2,19	22,25	239:15
optimization	7:10	outside	overturning	Panda/Koala
25:11,17,2	179:21,22	41:21	100:4	137:9
0 132:7	194:5,6	42:21	122:1	panel 1:9
133:15,18,	organisms	53:18	145:22	25:25 26:1
21 134:2	143:11	165:19	overturns	189:7,13
137:23,24	organs	228:25	122:21	203:1
138:16	164:11	304:2	232:7	217:19
139:2,13	original	323:15	overview	257:16
215:4	137:23	outsourcing	16:23	324:14
239:13,17,	254:8	251:2	203:19	panels
21	originally	outstanding	Overvold	331:25
optimize	195:14	295:4	2:23	pans 287:7
214:20	osmosis	341:20	overwinterin	paper 122:22
240:7	77:25 78:4	overall 53:9	g 296:7,12	papers
optimizing	others 71:13	208:7	305:4	123:13,25
133:19	183:9	210:12	307:14,25	Paquin 7:8
option 60:10	263:25	overburden	308:5	36:15,21
193:1	315:5	29:13		37:17,22
257:18	325:20	overflow	<hr/>	38:4
332:16	otherwise	135:16	p.m 129:8,9	160:22,25
333:6	191:8	268:3	200:17,18	161:1
options 52:2	ourselves	overlap	243:24,25	173:25
55:19,21	332:20	27:10	284:21,22	175:5,6
103:8	outcome 82:9	140:9,15	343:21	192:1,2,13
137:11	96:25	overlaying	page 9:2	193:23
161:7	104:2	327:6	10:2,25	218:25
268:5,20	145:24	overlooked	12:1 46:24	219:19
294:6	327:3	207:5	47:9	221:3
299:24	outcomes	overly 37:12	156:16	para 186:17
302:5	22:22	overlying	Pain 5:16	para-
332:9	215:7	213:13,17	paint 196:13	analysis
341:16	outfalls	overtop	Panda 25:19	186:1
order 19:10	335:8	311:18	130:5,6	paragraph
36:24	outflow	overturn	134:21	156:17
125:19,22	97:20	83:23	135:1,7,16	parameter
138:13	outlet 28:6		136:16	217:8
148:21			137:25	parameters
162:19				

405				
54:23 82:7	323:1	289:7,11,1	70:19	152:20
95:8	particularly	8 291:9,19	72:11	154:3,8,21
124:21	15:20	303:22,25	74:17	155:22
184:23	24:20 42:4	310:21	75:19	156:3
185:5	76:19	passages	79:25	157:3
312:19	117:7	288:15	83:13 84:1	158:15
parasite	119:20	passant	85:8,25	159:12
177:15	169:16	189:17	87:4 88:23	177:20
pardon	180:24	past 218:18	89:21 91:6	178:1,5,11
202:13	223:16	245:9	93:23 95:3	179:19
274:11	291:6	249:25	96:1 98:16	182:3
partially	302:17	262:24	100:12	186:12
77:5,6	parties 14:8	299:19	101:20	187:9
partic	15:20	334:7	103:16	189:10
181:25	16:5,21	patch 181:22	105:1	192:11
participant	17:1 24:6	Patenaude	106:7,18	194:3
181:25	26:12 27:2	5:6	107:11	196:25
228:10,20	32:19	patience	108:21	198:6,22
237:16	35:9,18,24	159:18	109:22	199:7
participants	36:2 45:2	338:4	111:8	202:1
285:8	118:16	Patrick 3:12	112:16	216:14,20
participate	124:11,12,	7:22 321:4	113:9	217:25
227:16	24 131:8	327:23	114:11	219:11
228:1,4	135:13	328:1,2	115:13,23	220:13
252:8	153:11	331:20	116:8	222:1
participatin	175:22	Paul 5:11,19	117:16	223:24
g 181:14	201:7,13,2	76:21	119:13	224:6
particle	3 202:6	pause 13:7	120:7	225:1
288:3	222:19,22	31:5 34:6	121:19	226:1
particles	230:22	36:8,19	125:15	229:10
166:23	236:14	37:6 38:8	126:11	230:11
particular	237:22	40:18	127:18	232:11
39:17	244:17	42:25	128:13,22	233:1,20
41:23	263:2,3	43:16	130:13,23	237:11
44:11	281:15	44:20 48:9	131:19	238:8
65:21	316:25	49:13	132:11,18,	239:3
69:15 90:6	321:16	50:17	24 133:24	241:11
91:16	323:8	52:7,13	134:17	242:13
122:15	341:13,22	56:8 58:5	135:3,19	244:7
133:19	342:2,5,11	59:15 60:7	136:25	251:15,21
191:23	pass 17:18	63:14	137:18	254:16,20
217:17	26:19 31:3	64:18	138:7,22	259:8
219:7	65:9 130:1	65:17,24	139:6,15	261:3
279:16	218:24	66:11	140:19	265:7,18
298:13	253:21	67:23	142:8,21	270:22
305:16	passage	68:17	143:15,23	274:6
	130:1	69:24	144:12	277:25
	190:15		145:3	278:13
	286:15		147:15	280:8
			149:3	282:16
			150:23	283:10

406				
284:15	294:12	253:5	286:10	89:25
308:21	327:8	263:6	permanently	perspective
311:22	perceived	perimeter	20:17	30:14 31:1
312:4	48:2	165:19	permeability	141:10
313:9	percent	period	20:25	240:2
320:4	44:13	9:9,12,15,	permin	263:1
334:9	73:13	20,23	181:14	281:1
340:23	102:6	10:4,7,10,	permissible	298:10,11
341:5	122:11	13 20:4	169:22	303:24
pay 249:23	125:23	23:8	269:10	305:8
peak 288:3	150:11	24:8,13,20	permission	pertinent
Pellissy	151:4,7,15	36:14	247:25	235:14
5:12	155:6,11	38:1,2	permit 29:18	Peter 5:2
people 66:19	169:11	81:10 94:5	249:4	6:2 86:15
80:5	204:25	96:9,15,17	permits	87:8 88:14
114:24	205:1,12	97:14	249:4	89:14
124:14	224:24	101:23,24,	permitting	90:23
198:13	225:7	25 102:5	25:21	91:17
201:18	238:20,23,	122:9	26:10	92:14
244:3	24 263:23	157:14	28:16	93:11
245:8	293:19	173:10	29:18	94:20
246:5,9,13	percentage	214:7	30:15 31:2	95:10,12
247:5,19	242:8	215:16	35:10,25	97:25
248:5,12,1	percentile	233:8	96:18	98:19
8 249:19	21:15	244:2	110:23	99:21
250:6,19,2	122:6	259:13	114:19	100:24
4	151:13	268:25	142:18	101:1,8
253:2,4,7,	283:6	279:10,24	143:20	102:7,9,10
8,20	284:4	280:14,18	218:14	118:12
312:24	perception	295:9	335:21	179:10
313:22	264:10	318:13	perpetual	181:3
316:8,24	perfect	329:5	227:2	221:14
328:4,7,25	92:15	337:1	perpetuity	223:14
338:10	124:4	periods	95:18	224:20
342:25	performance	97:23 99:3	223:22	225:3,15
people's	194:10	206:3	253:18	227:3,4
247:11	99:4,7	perma 254:6	257:2	255:1,7,12
254:4	performed	permafrost	268:2	,13 259:10
per 97:5	70:11,15	79:19	persist	261:14
165:21,22,	72:25 73:3	194:24	121:15	262:4
25	293:11	195:15,17	person 74:8	263:12,13
205:10,14	perhaps	314:3	244:4	274:16,25
209:3,6	41:25	permanent	250:7	275:5
212:24	138:5	114:16	286:2	297:23
242:20	173:5	115:2	312:24	298:18
243:5	190:23	121:8,10	Personally	319:1
266:12	210:7	228:10		329:22
282:25		253:2,25		333:8,14
288:4		254:1,6,7		338:22

407				
Peters 81:2	phosphorous	179:17,25	80:25	17,19,20,2
Peter's	327:5	180:3	81:1,4,5,6	2,23,24,25
275:20	phosphorus	194:21	,7,8 82:19	208:2,3,5,
Petter 6:25	171:12	195:1,8,11	85:1,13,21	6,8,12,24
phase 33:6	266:8,12	225:19	86:24	209:1,18,1
46:15	283:1	232:8	88:19,20	9,23,25
180:17,18	photo 264:11	258:15	89:6,10,19	210:2,5,7,
217:1	photographs	Pink 4:9	90:3,4,6,1	19,21,23,2
218:13,14	321:23	pipe	1,13	5
224:19	325:16	69:14,21	91:21,25	211:4,14,2
225:14	phrase 45:20	71:3	92:16	2
243:8	176:16	113:5,7	93:21	212:14,15,
283:3	physical	205:9,12,1	94:16	16,19,20
289:20	31:21	7 269:11	95:22	213:3,4
290:1	80:11	270:17	96:7,11,19	214:9,23
292:25	258:9	287:21	97:1,2,3,6	215:9
295:7	315:19	296:4,5	,8,10,19,2	219:24
305:15	physics	299:4	0,21 100:4	220:3,6,9
335:22	84:20	321:10	103:6,11,2	223:22
phases 17:17	phytoplankto	pipeline	4,25 104:1	242:24
161:6	n 30:21	54:12	113:18,19	254:8
phenomena	171:9,15,2	pipes 307:16	115:19	256:14,15,
40:15	5	pish 129:25	118:19	16,17
phenomenon	picked 122:6	pit 11:8	119:9,21	267:24
91:11	picture	19:18	122:9,12,1	268:1,3,6,
Phillips	196:13	20:8,19	4,24	16,21
63:12	PIDO 343:7	21:1,3,22	123:1,7,9,	270:1
200:8	piece 56:15	22:10,20,2	12,13,14,1	271:3
271:25	61:10	5 23:9	5,19 125:9	276:7
278:16	74:22	24:8,13,19	129:18,24,	278:22
303:4	pieces 247:8	,22 25:2	25	287:20
320:18	321:16	28:5 30:5	130:3,4,5	291:8
333:20	Pieters	41:25	131:6,8,13	314:5
phone 7:23	122:16	42:9,18	,14 132:22	317:10
8:8	pike 184:22	52:4,20	133:21,22	325:12
120:18,22	288:17	53:10	134:5,15	pits 11:19
125:1,6,25	pile 100:5	54:7,14	135:23	19:23,25
126:17	194:18,22	55:25	136:16	20:11
188:14	195:2	56:22	139:4	25:19
249:5	221:19	58:12	143:5	77:24
326:8,12	225:17,21	59:20	144:23	80:18,20
phonetic	264:11	60:16,20,2	145:21	81:8,16,18
19:3 28:7	275:1,4	5	146:5,9,11	,23 83:3
81:2	piles 100:17	61:2,21,25	157:14,22,	87:22
248:22		62:7,19	24 161:12	88:6,10,17
251:12		63:4,19	162:9	89:3,25
288:21		64:6,8,11,	165:19	90:5,19,21
		14,15	193:9	94:12
		76:7,18	203:22,23	117:10
			206:8,14	118:8,20
			207:10,16,	119:1

408				
122:1,21,2	30:20	192:6,18,2	175:12	120:20
3 123:3,24	32:6,9	3 193:1,7	222:10	125:4
134:21	33:23	206:13	226:25	150:20
136:19	34:1,4	214:10,12	230:9	152:13
145:18,23,	35:23,24	217:2	316:19	156:9
25 146:4	43:10	222:10,16	336:17,18	175:18
213:6,7	45:1,3	226:8,9,10	plans 25:11	179:16
239:15	46:11	,11 236:11	27:9 28:14	182:5
324:20	52:18	254:10	33:5,21	201:25
325:6,17	55:10	255:16	45:17 46:7	202:19
pit's 64:23	56:20 57:5	257:2	74:13	224:4
Pits 20:17	58:23	258:21	150:17	238:18
23:12,19	60:12	268:12	163:8	240:15
24:4 26:4	61:6,13	288:3	174:13	254:25
54:13	78:11,21	289:10	214:20	320:24
130:7	80:21	290:12,19	221:23	333:9
138:18	81:16	291:14	257:1	337:12
161:6	100:16,19,	292:8,24	287:7,16	pleased
203:25	20 101:5	293:3	288:21,23	215:10
206:9,11,1	106:5	294:21	289:15,19,	266:9
4 213:23	107:22,24	295:14	23 293:7,9	282:23
214:1,2,14	108:6,7,25	296:15	294:9	plenty 59:3
,19,21	109:15	298:9	299:2,3,24	plug 164:25
215:1,5	110:3,4,5	300:4,6,11	302:19	plugs 106:14
Pitt 19:3	111:20	302:21	322:17	plume 216:5
PK 25:18	114:18	303:12	336:15	217:23
214:20	115:8,17,2	304:1	plant 171:12	plural 314:1
215:5	1 116:2,15	305:15	Plate 7:23	plus 321:16
placed	117:21	306:2	116:24	Po 221:9
122:24	126:15	314:16,17	120:18,19,	point 41:19
123:15	129:20	316:16,17	22,23	43:19 49:4
136:15,19	130:16	317:1	326:8,9,12	55:3 56:19
213:7	131:7,10	318:11	Platt	57:22
217:5	132:1	323:10	125:1,3,6,	72:16
311:11,14	133:8	331:6	7,25	78:19 83:7
322:10	134:8	plane 260:24	126:2,17	91:20
placement	135:6,8,11	planet 79:18	321:7	112:4
239:14	136:21	planktivorous	play 149:16	114:14
places 69:4	137:3,9,14	s 172:19	197:16	118:15
placing	141:3,22	plankton	270:8	127:25
208:24	147:23	30:18	324:25	144:19
plain 18:19	148:19	45:16	plays 181:2	146:6
76:2	158:6	170:15,22,	please 15:9	149:22
plan 19:1	161:18	25 171:5	18:17	155:9
25:13	162:2,4,7,	172:19,24	36:17	157:21
26:9,13,16	23 164:10	173:23	43:14	160:23
29:11,17	168:6	planned	45:11	161:11
	170:19,21	331:22	67:15 86:6	
	173:22	planning		
	174:10,17			
	191:21,25			

409				
169:23	87:1,21	168:6,18	189:17	312:13
186:19	88:3 107:7	263:21	199:3,11,1	Powers 241:5
199:2,16,2	155:7,12	270:20	3 203:23	practic
1 206:20	164:22	277:14	205:23	241:7
208:11	170:18	282:13	206:5,22	practical
223:11	172:5	292:14	211:10	207:12
227:21	176:18	322:7	213:12	240:22
243:2	197:5,11	post 114:7	214:14	241:8,21
252:24	295:16	204:1	226:18	practice
324:24	297:6	206:10,17	237:2	214:15
327:20	330:25	209:10,19	271:3	245:20
pointed	Port 313:3	211:12	292:11,15	301:8
281:13	316:9	212:21	295:5	practices
pointer	portion 42:6	267:23	305:3	32:15
255:17	157:8	post-closure	314:6	241:20,22
points 105:9	205:22	18:5	322:22	289:4
120:16	portions	20:19,22	341:16	310:15
175:24	113:21	101:15,18,	potentially	prairie
176:2,8,14	pose 227:24	23,25	41:24	334:15,18
177:9	228:5	103:6	48:15	prayer
324:18	posed 263:16	119:10	53:7,10	13:18,21,2
pond 172:7	327:1	207:19	106:3	4
ponds 187:1	position	210:19	108:7	pre 220:7
Poole 7:12	59:19	211:5,24	136:22	preamble
poor 103:10	316:10,22	214:7	159:14	51:11 64:7
171:5	positive	221:22	194:12,23	114:22
193:13	55:10	267:25	198:2	175:14
208:25	97:20	268:6,15	208:21	precautionar
268:10	230:19	post-hearing	215:2	y 290:23
322:1	possibility	341:22,24	217:7	precipitatio
poorer	41:21	342:3	223:4	n 291:6
210:10	44:16	potassium	235:11	preclude
213:23	77:20	172:13	294:16	60:10
population	83:11	potential	pour 82:23	123:20
47:13	140:11	27:5 32:12	power 7:18	precluded
49:11	189:21	33:8 34:18	75:24	55:4 61:12
73:14,17	190:20	47:3 52:24	77:18	139:24
107:16	possible	53:4,22	78:24	140:1
150:13	18:20	55:23	81:25	212:3
151:4	27:20	94:23	83:24	precursor
186:3	38:17	108:14	84:10 86:1	182:11
204:22,24	39:25	127:8	179:5	predators
247:17	49:16 60:2	128:9	221:9,10	105:22
293:22	61:10	140:2	248:4	predication
populations	73:22	150:7	253:11	
11:17	74:1,5	158:8	312:7	
47:24	164:22	165:9,11	313:11	
		171:21	320:22	
		172:1	PowerPoint	

410				
122:1	61:20	173:12,18	presented	92:10
predict	preferable	184:1	27:22	133:14
82:11	140:25	188:25	29:25 31:9	235:3
167:21	142:12	192:4,9	32:4,10,14	previously
220:8	preference	200:15	33:2,7,22	36:25
313:6,17	37:9	201:8	49:19 53:5	107:3
318:11	preferences	202:5,10,1	55:19	226:9
predicted	308:8,9	6,19,21	123:25	306:23
19:22,25	preferential	203:18,19	140:5	prey 169:18
24:4 34:19	ly 308:16	215:14	208:11,20	pri 324:11
81:8,19	preferred	219:22	215:23	primarily
94:12	132:5	240:5,17	283:17	134:3
117:14	pre-mine	243:11,14	290:18	324:11
118:6	170:5	244:21	328:18	primary
127:10	preparation	252:21	presenters	158:18,24
150:10	28:13	254:13,25	201:4	principle
156:19	342:14	255:11	327:2	92:18
169:8,10	prepared	259:5,11	presenting	157:12
171:13	87:8 321:8	265:10,11,	16:16	158:1
180:1	prescriptive	14,16,20	321:9	178:17
203:21	82:11	284:18,25	presently	prior 25:21
207:16	241:18	285:3,15	197:18	54:24
212:20	present	288:9	presents	56:22
325:13	52:24	304:5	276:3	108:19
prediction	60:12	306:21	preserve	111:4
151:6	80:10	311:25	301:13	133:8
predictions	159:4	312:6	preserving	136:14
18:2 21:12	167:7	318:22	322:6	139:25
25:4 51:20	186:20	319:2,8	pressure	209:23
57:16,18	203:12	320:14,21,	40:4	235:6
58:2 90:20	265:11	25 321:1,8	287:11,24	252:21
104:16	288:12	325:16	pretty 86:18	267:20
107:8	321:11	327:23	221:20	291:23
135:15	338:9	329:9,15,2	224:23	295:6,7
148:6,12,1	presentation	4 330:5,16	240:21	324:1,16
4,21	9:8,11,14,	331:10	322:1	341:23
174:1,2,13	19,22	332:2	332:3	pristine
,19 220:19	10:3,6,9,1	333:24,25	prevent	167:22
276:11	2 15:9,14	334:11,22	33:17 50:2	privileged
278:21	16:8,9,11,	338:4,23	183:1	328:10
predictive	12 18:18	341:2	194:25	probabilisti
313:6	26:19 29:5	presentation	211:9	c 82:6
predicts	36:6,11	s 9:7	214:25	probabilitie
165:18	41:9 76:1	14:8,13	217:18,22	s 21:24
preening	119:6	16:4 86:5	previous	probability
270:5	160:14,19	160:7	60:2 84:6	19:14
prefaced		200:24	89:17	
		254:23		
		321:13		
		341:8		

411				
21:5,7,14,	,15	341:12	159:19	23:21 24:3
17 255:20	27:5,25	processed	program	25:3
257:4,5,9	28:16	83:6 130:6	33:13	27:6,14,19
probably	29:18	134:22	34:11,15	29:24
39:10	30:15 31:2	135:23	35:5 44:25	30:2,18
41:20	33:20	136:10,22	46:9 49:22	31:11 32:7
78:17	35:10	137:14	105:6,15	33:6
121:16	36:1,3	138:18	107:21	34:4,18
160:9	45:6	203:24	109:15	35:12 36:2
185:13	46:14,15	206:7,9	110:5	50:11
187:19	50:5,9	213:4,12,1	111:20	53:14
196:11	53:25 56:2	5,25	126:16	57:25
271:13	90:4 96:18	214:13,18	143:21	81:17 86:7
284:3	100:25	processes	148:4,5	90:7
307:24	110:23	29:16	167:12	91:13,16
312:21	114:19	31:21,23	169:1	92:19 99:1
322:1	117:24	90:3,16	174:7	104:22
problem	133:11	117:11	181:15	114:16
49:10	137:8,10	213:21	182:1,10	122:8,11
140:12	143:21	215:12	228:11,21	123:12,18
169:16	148:10	222:18	229:18	127:9
199:13	149:1	235:10	230:18	130:2,9,21
217:22	152:1,4,6,	237:16	254:7	134:4,5
271:3	7 153:6	325:5	266:18,25	145:9
problems	204:2	processing	267:14	147:6,10,1
190:2	206:20	292:22	285:10,21	1 156:21
196:6	207:5	produced	291:12	157:7,8,9,
procedure	212:9	165:15,18	programs	15
279:4	213:16	167:15	28:10	167:15,23
procedures	218:4	productivity	105:24	168:2,13
288:5	222:7,10,2	294:4	229:20	170:7
proceed	0 229:1	production	291:11	176:4
117:1	235:16	192:21	294:20	180:17
182:20	236:10,11,	295:21	progress	182:7
202:4,15	17,22	productively	59:2	189:5
282:6,12	248:2,14	14:9	108:16	191:22
283:14	249:15	productivity	110:8	193:7
289:21	262:21	31:20	200:1	198:12
290:2	267:15	105:10	266:17	203:17
293:1	277:8	285:22	prohibit	204:6,12
294:13	279:12	293:16	286:18	207:1,10
296:25	280:4,13	294:5,7	project 1:5	208:18
proceedings	281:9	304:8,13	13:13	215:24
334:21	285:8	profile	16:1,17	217:1,18
process	294:11	74:24	17:6,16,17	218:14
15:18 17:3	304:14	75:12	18:1 19:8	219:7
25:21	305:2	profiles	20:16,20	222:8
26:5,10,11	306:10		21:20	234:19,24
	315:12		22:5,7	253:13
	335:7			278:22
	336:21			285:15

412				
288:13	268:7	162:19	98:21	285:17
289:20	314:7,23	247:20	118:15	287:13
290:2	316:13	protecting	127:21	289:19
291:8,17	317:16	57:7	135:12	290:1
293:1,7,8,17	318:4	protection	138:16	302:6
294:7,12	336:24	35:4,20	140:16	332:22
296:25	340:14	61:16	147:24	335:6,13,21,22
299:11,13,17 304:24	Proponent's	250:1	156:25	provides
310:21	281:1	285:10,13,21 294:18	158:2	23:4 24:12
335:2,18,22 336:3,12	300:3	323:17	167:22	52:21
337:21	proportion	326:5	179:16	56:25
340:13	157:16	335:3,18	204:18	61:13
341:11,17	208:9	336:1	212:10	149:11,20
342:18	proposal	337:6,10,16,18	214:5	153:13
343:19	182:25	340:5,12	220:2	321:20
projected	propose	protections	231:25	providing
31:17 57:3	100:10	35:4	232:2	16:20 29:6
projects	proposed	protective	268:5	58:21
74:21	34:11	43:21 61:8	270:17,19	105:13
75:10	36:24 43:9	268:16	279:13	142:17
91:10,12	61:13,23	protocol	280:17	309:23
147:9	105:12	330:20	285:16	310:1
185:10	125:20	331:3	289:14	334:20
229:22	130:9	proud 152:9	292:15	provinces
295:20	131:7	prove 235:4	332:12	247:17,24
299:9,10	148:9	proven	335:16	provision
315:15	150:10	165:15	338:8	286:14
project's	168:5	proves	provided	292:12
18:3	170:18	136:22	26:23	provisions
168:11	191:24	270:4	35:18 37:4	101:15,17
promote	208:23	provide	45:3 49:5	proximity
98:23	211:1	11:2,5	53:1,8	31:10
211:23	212:15	16:22	56:14	179:14
pronounce	214:4	18:15 19:6	57:14	196:4
165:22	216:5	21:4 26:6	60:15,18,19 70:5,12	public 1:7
proper	218:7,10	33:5 39:2	96:21	8:18 9:17
309:25	242:19,21	47:3	103:9	13:12
332:6	262:17	62:12,16	114:2	181:20
proponent	267:16	65:3 66:23	116:25	243:16,19
76:1 212:3	287:20,21	80:15 84:9	121:5	244:2,4,9,11,15,18,20 250:16
222:9,24	337:23	85:15	127:23	251:11,19
229:25	341:15	88:12	156:15	252:1,9,15,20 264:2
232:20	proposing	90:12	161:21	332:7
235:4	43:11	94:18	162:8	341:24
236:15	89:18	95:10	168:20	
	108:1		206:16	
	194:11		213:24	
	protect		226:16	
			267:1	
			276:22	

413				
342:7,16,2 2,25	169:11	157:10	105:8	127:22
publically	qualitative	158:20,21	quantificati	128:7
181:13	220:18	162:14,16	on 293:16	129:19
publicly	221:2,5	165:6	294:4	131:4,22
228:9	263:10	169:4,11	323:23	133:3
pulling	quality 12:4	171:9	quantified	138:5
109:9	16:18,23	176:25	221:1	140:23
317:5	17:2,7,12,	177:3,10	quantity	144:6,20
pumped 78:2	22,25	178:21	21:2,24	145:10
83:7 208:4	18:1,2	193:2,13,2	22:4	146:3
210:4,25	19:7,16,18	1	176:25	147:19
212:14	20:5,8,21	203:21,22,	177:4	148:2,8
pumping 20:3	21:1,25	24 204:1	193:2	149:6
54:12	22:4,7,10,	4 206:10	223:10	152:12
103:22	11	207:16	Queen 246:9	155:5,24
207:22	24:15,20,2	208:5,8,23	248:11	173:10,20
purpose	5 25:1,4	,25	ques 64:9	174:21
80:19	27:6	209:1,6,17	quest 215:21	175:14,15,
96:10	28:4,23	,19	258:14	25 177:24
104:15	31:19	210:2,10,1	question	178:6,14
123:22	35:15,18	2	9:9,12,15,	181:23
253:10	47:5 51:16	211:4,11,2	20,23	182:14
purposes	52:22,23	1	10:4,7,10,	184:10,16
34:15	53:9,17	212:19,21	13 36:14	185:23
144:4	56:21 57:1	213:2,22	43:6,23,25	186:15
236:4	58:11,16	214:6,25	45:9 46:20	188:19
239:1,6	59:20	220:3,10,2	52:1 56:2	189:25
273:6	60:24 61:2	4 223:10	57:11 59:7	190:8,17
287:3	62:4	227:14	61:18,19	191:1,4
putting	64:6,8,14,	229:8	65:12,13	193:11,24
61:25	15,22	230:8	66:5,15,24	196:13,18
110:9	80:16	234:19,23	68:4	197:2,6,20
122:25	90:17	241:23,24	71:2,10,21	199:1
130:6	94:16,24	242:20	73:21 74:6	201:13
135:22	96:7	243:4	83:18	215:16
136:9	99:11,14	254:8	85:12	216:4,8,24
137:9	103:10,13	264:17	86:21	217:12
138:17	104:24	267:24,25	91:24	218:24
174:7	113:13	268:10,15	94:14	219:17
305:12,20	114:9	270:16	101:14	220:17
313:12	119:23	271:8	102:7	225:4
343:7	127:11	272:8,17	108:13	226:5
	134:7,14	276:7	112:3	227:22,24
	135:15	278:21	115:7	228:5,18,2
	136:20	287:18	118:25	1 229:3
	140:7,14	296:18,19,	119:5,17	230:3
	145:20	20 305:6	120:2	231:25
qua 242:25	146:1	317:9	126:3,6,23	233:6,14
qual 64:8	147:3,11	quantifiable		237:14
	148:20			239:13
				241:14,16

414				
242:17	103:1,4,5	239:8,9,12	,20,24	Racher 2:13
243:2	104:8	240:10,13	330:1,4,6,	14:20
258:14	111:24	243:12	9,10	137:20
259:13	112:1,24,2	244:17	331:7,11,1	138:24
261:14,19	5 113:4	259:14,17,	2,13,16,17	139:17
262:19	116:18,19	18,22,23	333:15,17,	141:11
263:4,16	117:1,25	260:1,2,5,	20,23	142:24
268:25	120:17	6,9,10,13,	337:2	
270:11	124:6	14,17,18,2	338:3,5,11	radically
271:1	127:2,4	2,25	,15,16,19,	238:21
273:4,24	128:24,25	261:5,8,10	20,24,25	Radium 313:3
275:20	129:3,4,12	,15,16	339:3,4,7,	316:10
279:3,9	,16	265:3	8,11,12,15	raft 56:19
281:7	136:10,12	269:2,5,6,	,16,19,20,	92:22
283:24	144:1	17	21,22,25	
295:9	149:24	273:20,21	340:1,20	rainbow
296:13,21	150:2,9	274:9,10,1		143:8
299:21	153:19	3,14	quibble 82:1	273:14
302:3,23	156:7,12	275:6,8,11	quick 114:22	raise 332:23
304:23	159:7	,12,15,16	174:25	raised 147:4
306:22	173:12,17	276:3	177:25	196:21
309:1,16	179:2,4,6,	277:17,21	269:4,5	227:23
310:25	8	278:4,5	337:5	245:21
317:8	181:5,7,10	282:19,20	quickly	261:24
318:13	182:6	284:11,12	113:24	263:18,22
321:19	183:17,18,	295:10,13	176:12	264:2,5,7
326:16	21,22,25	297:11,13,	quite 40:2	271:9
327:1	186:18	16,17,20,2	43:12 44:6	321:13
329:5	187:24,25	1	73:6 92:18	322:23
330:13	188:3,4,7,	298:19,21,	111:16	331:23
331:21	8,11,12,15	24	121:2,9	332:25
337:1,5	,16,20,21,	300:9,18,1	122:14	336:20
340:4,8,19	25 189:1	9,22,23	153:6	raising
questioning	200:8,10	301:1,2,5	157:8	261:24
14:8 36:11	201:7,12,1	302:7,8,9,	177:1	ran 94:9
39:9 51:12	4 202:9,11	12,13,20,2	178:18	96:9
225:17	215:17,18,	4 303:1	191:12	
252:22	21,23	306:16,17	195:12	Randy 7:19
questions	217:14	318:15,17,	198:14	68:24,25
16:2 45:8	218:5	18,23,24	233:8	70:25
50:21,23	219:9	319:3,4,7,	280:24	71:15,16
51:3,7,10	221:7,11,1	9,12,13,16	296:6	73:19
57:14 60:2	2 227:5,6	,18,21,23,	315:23	259:25
63:25 65:6	228:22	25	327:15,16	274:12
68:21,23	231:5,6,9,	320:1,6,9,	quote 46:25	297:19
69:1	10,13,14,1	10,14,15,1	256:17	329:18
86:2,3,6,1	8	8,20	312:18	338:18
3,17	234:10,11,	326:15		
102:20,23,	14,15	328:18		range 22:4
25	238:5,10,1	329:7,10,1		23:23 82:9
	3,14	1,15,16,19		124:14

415				
150:13	201:22	0 22:18,24	61:8,15	26:8
165:24	257:9	23:6 94:10	158:8	328:14
290:9	276:10	96:24	193:14	recognizes
ranging 28:3	realistic	118:5	206:23	248:14
92:23	24:2	148:16	220:11	recommend
Ransom 6:19	reality	149:8,21	267:5	148:24
rare 304:25	175:4	182:11	284:2	149:11
rate 50:9	realized	reasonably	recent 11:2	182:24
97:6	324:7	34:20	18:25	192:17
165:20	325:14	208:5	35:12 39:3	193:6
rates 177:16	really 41:17	reasoning	44:7 246:7	211:9
292:1	55:22	199:18	recently	214:19
rather	57:11 76:4	reasons 26:2	70:15	254:5
154:24	79:1 85:20	61:24	153:10	301:24
163:10	86:17 91:2	107:25	172:4	322:9
165:7	92:10	122:22	216:7	323:3
166:21	101:16	163:11	293:18	325:25
267:9	124:15	reassure	299:11	recommendati
299:4	156:25	314:24	recessing	on 24:7,10
ratio 123:8	194:16	315:3	86:10	25:15
rationale	196:11	Rebecca 4:14	129:8	26:18,24
61:25	201:7	rebound 40:7	200:17	27:17
189:24	228:16	rebuild	243:24	29:19
220:2	248:13	307:4	284:21	30:16
ratios	252:19	recalculate	recharged	31:9,14
123:23,24	256:20	287:25	97:12	32:14 33:3
rays 74:11	257:12,17	recalibrated	reclaimed	55:4,6
re 9:7 16:11	259:5	276:10	288:24	183:4
325:11	307:16,17	rece 61:1	reclamation	207:2
reach 165:20	313:16	recede 49:6	25:12	211:8
166:15	314:8,15,1	receive	100:16	212:2,11,1
205:9	7	134:22	130:20	2 214:24
209:3	315:18,24	209:11	288:21,22	224:10
reaches	316:6,21	337:24	289:23,24	249:14
255:17	realm 41:21	340:13	recognizable	250:21
reading	reason 73:5	received	328:24	257:11
240:20	90:18	37:3,21	recognize	258:25
310:4	96:14	202:12	82:12	321:21
ready 200:14	122:20	receiving	171:2	324:14
253:19	123:22	18:4,7	206:21	325:22
reaffirms	153:5	28:11,24	247:10	330:17
59:18	174:12	30:13,25	263:21	333:2
real 53:1	190:15	35:21	290:15	342:21
121:13	236:25	59:22	296:4	recommendati
	313:15	60:13	301:12	ons 16:22
	reasonable		328:25	24:6,18
	19:5		recognized	28:11,18,1
	21:11,18,2			9 29:25
				32:4,10,13

416				
33:4,7,10, 22,24 35:17 45:2 51:24 147:21 180:22 191:20 192:5,16 196:2 203:15 224:13 225:9 258:20 266:11 288:10 290:3 295:3 299:23 302:17 303:6,7,10 ,18 321:15 330:15 335:13 336:20	119:21 135:1,11 206:13 reconnected 42:2 113:13 213:8 214:3 289:1 reconnection 157:24 record 38:23 63:7 172:9 192:8 201:9,18 244:20 272:2 341:24 342:7,16,2 2 recorded 71:12 278:17 341:23 recourse 249:18 recover 113:24 recreational 285:23 286:5,12 recruitment 198:3 red 18:9 271:8 Reddy 5:24 redefine 206:19 reduce 172:1 211:22 224:13 225:10 341:16 reducing 210:10	reduction 204:22,24, 25 205:1 238:23 re-emphasize 325:11 reestablish 113:17 114:1 146:24 reexamination 277:8 ref 95:9 refer 53:3 54:4 192:8 325:15 reference 11:16 29:21,23 52:11 87:20 88:2 94:18 95:9 108:17 109:4,12,1 8,19 110:2,14,2 1 111:12,13 118:14 161:4 167:10,11, 19 168:5,12,1 3,14,19 325:18 referred 122:10 145:13 184:6 referring 49:25 122:16 refine 292:7 refined 64:10 refinement	235:12 reflect 328:5 reflected 204:23 refrain 315:11,12 regard 56:16 158:5 180:24 182:23 322:6 regarding 19:22 24:7 25:18 26:24 28:19 29:6,13,20 30:1,17 33:23 65:13 122:25 156:7,13 177:3 215:4 288:20 290:3 292:19 294:3 324:6 337:8 regardless 175:10 regards 46:23 86:5 108:14 117:4 150:19 175:23 181:10 200:24 227:19 228:8 266:11,24 267:23 322:21 323:12 330:16	region 299:4 334:15,18 regional 204:7,11,1 6 285:9 334:14 336:9 register 252:11 271:20 registered 248:25 252:12 registration 248:24 regular 162:25 regulate 198:12 regulated 100:17,21 regulation 144:7 286:20 336:13 regulations 286:16 334:25 336:7 regulators 33:18 46:17 50:4 110:7 168:20 regulatory 26:17 33:6 45:5,6 46:14 51:1 100:22 119:25 153:8 162:25 175:9 203:3 212:9 215:12

417				
217:1	158:20	276:2	321:6	70:3,6,13,
222:6	176:7			17 107:17
224:19	184:16	relieve	reminded	147:21
225:13	189:4,5	201:11	101:3	148:15
235:9	203:13	relinquished	248:2	152:5
236:10,17	206:6	236:5	reminder	161:25
243:8	295:4		14:6 182:5	163:25
267:15	303:18,19	relinquishme		179:12
276:22	335:2	nt 234:24	remnant	181:11,13,
283:3,14	336:3,12,1	relocation	113:20	17
285:9,16	3	292:4,21	removal	192:3,9,18
289:20		rely 171:1	293:20	196:1
290:1	relates	172:21	324:1	198:10
292:25	122:2			202:10
295:7	131:4	relying 79:2	remove	203:15
300:10	132:3	91:1	150:11	204:22
304:14,20	138:4		291:22	209:10
305:2,15	193:11	remain 19:25	310:13	214:8
306:10	207:15	23:13 24:4	removed	221:16
332:11	259:1	42:11	323:22	228:9,13
	286:13	80:22		252:10
reit 314:15	303:20	81:8,19,23	repeat 272:2	266:2,4
		89:6 90:21		285:18
reiterate	relating	96:12	repeatedly	291:24
142:11	120:3	113:18,19,	142:13	334:23
225:8	196:18	22 118:11	256:25	335:14
226:23		125:8	316:13	342:14,18,
314:15	relation	135:8	rephrase	19
322:24	166:17	163:20	177:24	
324:9	201:8	254:9		reported
reiterated	relatively	remained	replace	36:25
143:4	73:8 88:17	27:13	295:20,25	39:13
	92:6		307:4	71:13
reiterates	113:23	remaining	replaced	106:10
31:16	178:22	115:10	115:5	122:18
relate 104:8	release	208:25	306:8	
121:25	269:7,18	210:19		reporting
215:23,24	310:19	remains	replaces	193:13
269:6		213:11	337:7	
related 17:2	released	232:20	replied	reports
23:17	169:25	314:11	176:11	47:25 73:1
24:19	270:16			155:8
31:21	324:3	remarks	replies	165:3
32:4,11	relevant	341:10	31:15	276:23
33:1 34:2	17:9	remediating	reply 280:2	279:8
46:22	207:17	231:21	281:18,24	280:23
101:6	237:23		report	342:8
103:5	288:17	remember	16:22,25	repre 327:2
122:9	reliable	75:22	25:16 29:9	represent
131:14	277:2	127:24	34:10	21:7,8,10,
133:15	reliance	remind	39:14,16	14 23:5
136:17		244:15	47:9	24:2 190:9

418				
193:14	11:6 22:21	215:3	respect	124:24
196:23	27:22	ResCan 70:9	11:12 14:7	127:21
representati	30:11	research	41:10 55:3	133:3
ve 170:3	53:15 56:4	73:3	56:19 57:6	144:19
representati	61:5	165:22	67:8,20	145:10
ves 327:2	62:6,17	reservoir	112:9	148:18,22
represented	115:9	184:22	130:16	161:24,25
23:7	133:8,11	residence	133:18	170:16,19,
represents	142:14	157:15	137:25	21 177:1
21:18,19	162:18	146:8	157:15	192:15
22:13 23:3	173:23	residents	177:13	194:8
reproduction	175:3,8	250:3	241:8	221:6
165:10	178:8	residual	283:17	224:2
reproductive	186:17	94:24	286:23	239:24
190:19	191:21	152:1	288:10	258:13
request	195:15,16	294:10	290:5	266:4
20:6,11	204:11	resisting	291:21	276:13
53:24 64:3	212:7	76:4	309:1	279:13
123:10	214:20	Resolution	respectful	280:17
124:11	236:13	8:8 128:25	328:13,24	281:23
143:2	243:1	188:13,15	respectively	291:14
145:14	287:8	238:6	21:9	315:7,16
162:24	288:19	252:7	respond 68:6	321:19
175:15,21	294:10	260:25	228:25	330:15
176:10	304:20	277:22	308:3	336:18
276:9	305:18	302:9	responded	responses
322:16	310:16	320:2	51:13,23	16:21
335:14,19	332:12	331:13	83:17	50:20
requested	requirement	339:21	response	53:25
28:13	30:6 46:9	resolve	33:14,21	112:21
requesting	152:16	341:20	43:2,23	143:4
212:6	162:25	resolved	45:1,17,18	155:2
requests	201:12	266:7,10	,23	161:25
31:15	requirements	295:6	46:7,12	172:25
51:13	14:7	resource	47:8 48:14	279:19,22
112:21	30:11,13,2	181:16	49:19,22	responsibili
118:2	5 102:4	228:12	50:11 54:5	ties
124:24	175:10	290:24	56:3	336:4,13
162:21	222:12	316:2	57:10,14	responsibili
require	309:25	338:9	61:20,23	ty
33:16 50:1	336:7,16	resources	66:6,23	247:19,20
151:22	requires	51:1,2	68:15	responsible
161:17	161:4	173:16	77:23	16:1
254:6	167:23	175:20	84:9,12,19	115:10
309:12	requiring	202:24	85:5,11	116:3,6
required	211:14	203:1,4,15	88:11	179:15
	212:13	241:15	106:10,15	231:21
			108:3,6,7	233:17
			118:1	234:7

419				
254:9	152:8	14:14,17	20	55:1,2
300:4,5	resulting	17:3 19:19	320:15,18,	62:8
304:15	79:16	20:6 23:21	20 322:17	63:16,17
responsive	203:22	26:5,13,16	324:16	64:20
336:20	206:5	,17	331:24,25	65:2,19
rest 282:2	253:24	27:1,5,18,	332:6,11,1	66:1,13
restoration	results 11:2	25 33:6	5,25	68:2 76:25
299:9,13	20:24	36:3 39:5	333:2,17,2	78:8 83:15
restored	22:1,9,11,	63:12	0 335:6	84:3,4
115:10	23 23:6,7	100:22	336:21	85:10
254:8,10	35:15	114:18	340:1,20	87:6,12
restoring	37:2,4,10,	117:24	341:18	88:9 95:5
115:5	14,19	129:4,12,1	342:7,10,1	100:14
restratify	38:14,17,1	5 153:22	2,15,17	101:2,22
85:21	9	162:22,24	reviewed	106:22
144:23,24	39:3,16,17	168:20	26:10	115:15,25
146:4,18	,24 70:15	176:11	226:13,19	116:10
result 19:11	124:12	180:7	275:3	127:20
20:16,20	137:4	182:16,20,	reviewers	128:15
28:24	138:16	21,24	172:25	130:15
31:18 49:7	139:1,4,11	183:5,12,1	reviewing	131:21
64:14	148:5,21	4	236:2	133:1
77:16	170:4	189:1,4,7,	reviews	138:9
99:18	174:14	13 190:7	226:7	139:8
104:22	276:5,21	192:8	237:7	140:21
122:23	286:3	195:10	285:10	142:10
130:20	resuming	200:8,10	revise	147:17
134:9,10	86:11	207:7	287:23	154:18,23
136:20	129:9	216:2	revised	155:13
162:16	200:18	229:24	162:1,7	159:10,14
170:7	243:25	230:21	192:6	188:23
171:15	284:22	239:9	193:6	238:16
174:3	resuspension	240:9,13	220:8	239:7,8
205:24	323:12	241:3	258:21	261:12
206:24	325:4	242:2	337:10,16	278:7
212:18,21	retain	243:10	revisions	279:1
213:2	229:16	244:16,19	337:16	280:5,10
217:7	Rettie 3:16	261:16,21	revolved	282:7,18
220:5	returned	265:3,5	73:21	302:15
242:19	235:7	271:25	Richard 2:21	320:12
249:18	263:20	276:21	14:23	331:19
287:9	328:8	278:16	15:10,11	332:20
289:5	reverse 46:3	282:20	36:4,5	333:12
291:17	77:25 78:4	284:12	37:8,23	339:24
293:17,21	revi 220:8	285:17	38:10 41:6	Richea 5:23
301:19	review 1:3,9	287:6,7	43:3,18	50:24,25
resulted	11:4 13:11	289:15	52:9	55:15,16
		290:1		57:8,9
		303:1,4		59:5,6,23,
		304:24		24 61:17
		306:15,17,		63:1,2

420				
65:7,8	216:22,23	258:15,17,	124:10	79:3,4,7
68:19,20	218:1,2	21	142:16	84:25
173:14,15	219:13,14	264:9,11,1	running	123:14,18
174:23,24	222:3,4	2 275:1,3	243:16	208:7,9
175:13,19,	224:3,8,9	311:8,10	runoff	210:4
20 177:22	225:5,6	rocks 194:17	54:17,21	salinity
178:3,4,25	226:3,4	Roger 6:4	97:13	78:4
179:1	229:12,13	259:4	98:24	79:11,15
203:2	230:13,14	role 285:23	99:18	210:9
220:15,16	231:22,23	roles	146:11	327:7
239:22,23	232:13,14	336:3,12	157:17	salt
241:13,14	233:3,4,22	Ron 6:7	runs 20:5	123:8,23
242:15,16	,23	254:14	124:21	salt-filled
259:20,21	235:1,2	room 211:1	rushes 79:22	317:19
297:14,15	236:6	234:1	<hr/>	salvaged
318:20,21	237:13	251:8	<hr/> S <hr/>	323:4
329:13,14	238:19	281:17	S4 287:18	sample
338:13,14	239:5	328:14	288:4	185:11
Rick 5:15	344:6	Rose 2:7	Sachi 2:4	186:1,6,17
15:6	Roberts 5:5	7:11	63:25	187:5
16:13,15	robust	Ross	64:1,21,25	samples
92:24	124:17	160:15,16	67:14	185:14
249:25	174:7	176:5	129:14	241:9
rightly	267:3	178:13	130:25	sampling
157:8	314:16	182:8,9	131:23	11:3 34:11
rights	rock	183:3	132:13,20,	36:24
246:25	28:15,21,2	189:12	21 133:13	37:3,13
248:8,9	5	191:2	134:19	39:5
rigorous	29:2,8,9,1	199:24	135:10	164:20,22
195:23	1,15 64:8	rotifers	136:7	184:19
ris 258:1	98:2,3,14,	172:9	189:3	186:21
risk 62:4	22	Round 85:14	190:6	187:23
91:21	100:4,17,1	94:17	191:18	325:23
180:9	8 101:6	112:21,22	193:10	Sanderson
221:18	157:17	118:12,17	194:6	4:25 6:5
225:20	179:13,17,	123:10	239:11	sandpit
258:1,9	25	175:21	240:9	317:22
290:13	180:3,7,22	176:7	safe 129:25	sands 270:14
291:18	193:12	rounds 31:16	164:9	271:9
risks	18,21,22,2	85:18	177:6,12	Sangris 7:17
164:14,19	3	Ruari 2:6	safely	Sarah-Lacey
road 189:18	195:1,2,3,	246:18	304:17	6:15
309:13	8,11,13,18	rules 246:18	safety	183:20
311:18	,21,25	run 83:21	336:13	265:21
Robert 5:20	196:3,5,6	96:14,16	saline	Saskatchewan
8:6	221:19	97:14	77:20,23	
202:22,23	225:17,19,		78:1,22	
	21 232:8			
	257:21			

421				
256:15	164:21	205:4	schedule	189:16,25
sat 200:1	165:7	Sauvauge	220:9	205:18
satisfaction	166:7	42:16	scheduled	207:15
153:11	168:15,24	Savauge	267:16	230:3
249:16	169:20	163:7	scheme	238:18
306:11	170:1,4	saw 14:25	151:22,24	258:25
satisfactori	171:14	15:7	science	288:4
ly 200:2	172:17	scale 28:2	71:17	secondarily
satisfactory	177:7	73:17	81:22	283:7
221:5	187:3,4,13	102:17	scientific	secondary
satisfied	190:22,24	106:10	18:20	44:16
261:25	193:18	178:7,15,1	scope 182:6	secondly
262:11,16	194:1	7 204:16	scouted	197:10
satisfy	196:4	scales 27:20	117:7	seconds 80:3
332:9	197:4,5,12	102:13	scratching	section 51:1
Saturday	,18,20	176:2	240:23	161:3
333:14	198:1	178:9	screened	203:3
Sauvage	204:9,18,2	207:8	51:4	252:1
18:2,8	205:1,6,23	scenario	sculp 164:1	286:13,16
20:18,21	206:2,23	11:7 20:10	sculpin	303:22
22:20 24:9	207:14,18	21:11,15,1	163:9,12	sections
27:13 28:5	208:1,13	9	164:1,3	285:25
31:10 42:2	210:13	22:8,17,19	sculpins	securities
44:13	211:12,23	,23	163:20	235:7
46:23	217:23	23:6,15	sea 84:24	security
47:2,17,19	220:11,24,	24:1,3	Seale 3:24	234:25
,23	25 238:23	40:1 41:10	season 74:4	236:4
48:6,24	252:25	53:5 60:22	159:22,24	sediment
49:9 54:24	253:25	61:21	290:17	11:3 29:14
69:4,11	254:1,2	62:5,18	291:5	36:24 37:1
71:7,14,22	258:19	64:11,16	309:9	39:4
72:4,16	263:9	85:2	seat 13:4	165:13,23
99:13	264:16	94:8,9,11	sec 154:11	166:21
104:24	266:21	118:5,8	second 49:20	167:2,16
106:1	287:4	119:1	52:10	289:19
107:4	289:1,25	122:4,5	65:21	310:19
108:18	290:8,21	140:17	94:14	324:2
112:7,13	291:23	141:8,20	131:3	sedimentatio
118:19,23	292:15,21,	142:12	132:3	n 199:12
119:21	22 293:20	scenarios	152:12	sediments
139:25	294:5	19:15	153:9	28:20
145:20	296:2,14	23:14,25	154:5	262:12
150:11	297:4	26:7 63:4	177:25	seed 313:5
153:4	305:21,22	81:14,18	184:16	seeing
157:11,18,	306:24	90:18		140:10
25 159:4	323:18	94:12		
162:16,19	335:9	104:5		
163:7	340:6,12,1	145:18		
	6			
	Sauvage/Lac			

422				
253:13	98:11,13	112:8	sets 70:2,8	188:14
seek 45:21	99:8,19	147:10	setting	shed 78:2
190:24	100:4	194:16	149:18	sheet 154:19
308:16	193:12,13	234:23	202:7	shift 170:8
seeking 68:6	194:25	separated	266:11	shifts
295:19	195:22	194:23	287:1	171:3,8
seeks 267:18	196:10	213:16	settle	Shiga 8:3,18
341:20	221:18	separately	165:13	113:2,3
seem	225:20	266:21	167:3	114:4,20,2
43:10,24	258:2,11	separates	213:16	1 115:20
69:16 74:5	seeps 232:8	80:9	settlers	116:4,16
91:22	segregated	September	246:10,12	188:2
121:15	194:22	1:24	seven 151:8	231:16
159:22	seiche 39:25	293:12	246:22	232:5,21
169:13	40:3 41:24	series 51:7	309:4	233:15
199:11	219:8	57:18	several	234:9
280:22	select	148:13	14:13	251:19
seemed 71:1	147:12	serious	32:10	252:11,16,
332:3	selected	32:18	33:2,7,22	17 260:16
seeming	82:8 122:3	47:22	81:14	275:18
79:19	selection	286:4,9	86:22 98:4	276:14,24
seems 14:24	108:17	287:17	122:21	277:16,17
46:21	selenium	289:5,16	143:3	300:25
47:7,18	185:19	290:14	221:15	317:8
84:20	self-	291:19	266:3	319:20
102:16	sustaining	294:10	267:2	331:9
169:15	129:23	301:9	268:1	339:14
172:24	176:17	service	308:15	Shin 8:3,18
180:25	sense 58:19	160:20	324:5	113:2,3
182:18	140:3	services	severely	114:4,20
197:17	305:21	250:25	250:25	115:16,20
199:22	322:4	334:15	sewn 279:7	116:4,16
216:2	sensitive	Sesame	shallow	188:2
238:21	103:11	256:17	69:22 71:2	231:16
282:11	104:4	sess 285:24	317:20	232:5,21
310:5	223:16	session	shallows	233:15
seen 55:18	sensitivity	109:8	69:5	234:9
141:18,25	20:5	136:11	253:14	251:19,24
155:8	sentence	227:13	share 150:17	252:16,17
187:16	156:16	252:6	223:20	260:16
216:7	sentiments	sessions	326:7	275:18
271:7	328:5	19:12,20	shared 323:7	276:14,24
314:22	separate	127:22	sharply	277:16,17
315:7	44:10	setback	172:10	300:25
316:23	82:1,2,5	287:25	Shawn 8:8	317:8
seep 97:7				319:20
seepage 29:1				331:9
				339:14

423				
Shirley 4:16	59:12	171:3	332:14	288:22
sho 40:8	82:4,5	172:5,16	similarly	317:10
shoal 32:1	133:5	181:20	100:19	sited 90:5
70:10,16	199:11	182:16,17	Simon 2:5	sites 86:23
287:17,19	321:23	183:2,5,8	7:22 321:4	122:15
288:4	325:2	186:8,9	328:1,2	218:19
296:7,16,1	shrinking	190:10	Simone 5:25	233:25
7,20 307:4	111:6	191:14	simple	234:2
shoals 31:17	267:7	193:14	174:12,21	site-
46:23	sic 231:23	196:23	269:12	specific
47:1,11	251:6	197:3,10,1		25:1
71:6,7,11	341:15	198:14,20	simply	205:11
72:18	sides 48:23	199:4	160:21	sitting
165:12,13	sig 46:2	210:3	174:11	203:1
166:6,16,1	91:23	211:10	184:24	245:4
8 167:9	sign 230:19	253:3	192:8	situation
196:19	signature	254:3	252:23	50:13
197:9,25	248:14,15	255:25	253:19	55:13
296:16	signi 166:1	256:3	304:11	56:16 91:1
shock 264:3	significance	264:24	simultaneous	92:6,11
shore 40:8	55:23	291:16	65:14 66:7	93:9,14
shoreline	150:7	296:24	76:14	94:7
307:5	152:15	303:13	single 65:12	193:17
short 71:1	175:23	significantl	sit 160:8	252:10
73:8	176:3,7,18	y 186:8	244:5	256:12
111:16	,23 191:11	205:5	245:5	264:22
163:19	204:5,8	silt	246:17	324:15
168:18	205:3	217:19,20	277:10	situations
175:6	206:16	218:9	343:12	88:19
177:1	262:20	323:13,15,	site 18:3	117:13
178:5	305:16	17,19,21,2	19:15	271:8
199:1	327:4	4,25 324:2	22:10	six 186:22
220:17	significant	similar	30:13,25	187:14
shorter	20:20	11:12	54:23 90:1	sixteen
126:9	46:2,4	15:15 22:2	91:20	110:16
shortly	65:14	30:10 66:9	99:11	sixty
160:23	91:23	67:9,20	153:10	126:7,22
showed	104:23	83:18	180:23	sixty-five
325:16	115:3	89:11 90:5	204:1	242:6
showing 44:8	141:17	91:2 114:2	206:6,24	sixty-one
shown 18:9	145:25	121:7	207:10,11	242:6
21:4	150:21	122:11	209:9	size
22:1,12	152:25	154:14	211:7	186:1,6,17
172:5	153:14	225:16	213:2	187:5
shows 22:12	162:15	256:10	214:11	Sjoerd 6:24
	166:1	271:8	222:23	
	169:12	302:3	223:17	
		315:4	234:7	

424				
skin 164:25	326:5	328:20	284:4	319:17
skip 176:12	slides 172:4	snacks 343:5	son	333:10
265:23	204:18	snorkel	245:17,19	337:13
Slave 8:3	219:22	72:25	sooner 60:4	339:22
113:1,3	257:13	SNPs 169:1	62:1,3	sort 62:10
114:5,21	265:23	social 250:2	267:9	66:16
115:21	312:12	societal	sorry 39:9	78:14
116:5,17	335:12	176:21	42:5 45:12	142:2,3
188:1,3	slight 317:6	262:22	46:20	150:3
231:15,17	slimy 164:1	Society 8:17	62:13	154:24
232:6,22	sloshing	socio-	63:17	180:14
233:16	40:13	economic	69:14	186:1
234:10	slow 18:11	176:13	71:16 75:2	226:23
245:17	sludge	solid 23:5	83:24	227:1
252:18	122:24	78:21	85:11	229:21
253:1	slurry 83:7	solidify	101:2	230:22
260:15,17	213:13,14,	268:12	102:10	235:20,21
275:17,19	25 214:20	solids 19:22	109:16	236:22
276:15,25	215:5	23:3	127:25	237:21
277:17	small 41:25	158:25	132:20	240:22
300:24	47:12	168:3	138:20	241:22
301:1	69:11 71:6	205:8	146:20	242:9
319:19,21	74:22 97:6	213:15,16	151:12	263:10
331:8,10	102:17	216:18	156:10	280:12
339:13,15	106:9	solution	163:4	286:22
slew 326:19	163:9,12	226:25	164:17	313:12,13,
slice 96:20	184:4,5,12	227:2	169:9	14 316:22
slide	5 264:10	316:14	170:11	317:5,7,13
18:14,15	292:4	solutions	175:19	,25 321:21
20:23 22:1	313:3	203:8	178:14	322:9,13
36:16,22	328:4	223:1	180:12	323:23
39:12 43:7	small-bodied	226:24	184:8	324:25
45:13	105:12,21	somebody	186:8	332:17
49:17	106:16	70:23	187:11	sorts 310:19
51:25	107:1,3,8,	201:24	189:24	sought
103:5	16,25	somehow	193:22	246:24
104:8	184:2	216:6	198:24	sound 343:7
127:6,7	292:11	someone	215:21	source
144:2	smaller	38:13	216:16	158:19
160:18	72:19	233:17,18	221:9	168:1
196:18	105:18	234:7	225:4	sources 19:7
199:10	164:24	somewhat	244:22	157:12
238:18	187:2	89:7	251:12	181:22
240:15	204:23	somewhere	270:1	south 223:17
242:4	smarter		271:4	southern
258:2			280:10,12	247:16
312:11			283:23	Souza 2:4
321:20			285:6	
325:2,10			293:25	
			294:1	

425				
64:1,25	,22 76:24	44:5,10,11	272:11,23	81:23
67:14	165:17,24	,17,24	specified	90:21
129:14,15	166:5,6	47:20	243:1	92:4,9
130:25	167:9	50:14	speculative	96:13
132:13,14,	190:18,22	72:20	233:6	118:11
20,21	191:6	73:11	speed 41:3	121:2
133:13,14	196:19	105:16,18	94:2,4,5	122:13
134:19,20	197:21,22,	113:25	122:3,6,7,	211:24
135:10	25 198:4	143:19	8	214:6
136:7	199:13,14	163:9,13	Spencer 3:4	219:3
189:3	296:13	164:6	spend 80:3	220:6
190:6	305:6	165:5	spent 124:14	310:22
191:18	speak 17:4	169:18	spoiled	313:22
193:10	54:3 56:16	170:8	343:15	315:5
239:11	201:25	171:22,24,	spoke 184:1	327:15,16
240:9	213:1	25 173:3	201:2	Stacey 2:9
sovereign	223:2	190:19	342:11,25	staff 2:2
246:3	244:16	197:22	spots 307:7	14:15,22
sovereignty	246:15	269:20,22	spreadsheet	86:18
246:3,4,6	248:20	288:12	96:21	99:25
sow 313:5	263:15	295:16,20,	spring 69:4	129:5,6,12
space 74:25	334:21	21	313:24	156:7,13
313:15	335:12	specific	stab 317:13	189:2
spaces	speaker	18:9 37:19	stability	200:9
166:23	244:11	50:8 92:11	20:12 79:5	202:6
167:1,3	251:11,18,	93:14	90:15	203:9,11
spacial	19	104:12	96:19	239:10
27:10	speakers	130:19	103:11	240:10
34:17,19	244:13,20	161:19	118:1	261:14,17
span	327:13	191:20	129:16	265:4
163:20,23	speaking	192:5,16,1	133:22	282:9,21
164:1,5	251:25	9 235:5	210:22	303:2
Sparling 4:8	264:8	307:13	224:14	306:16
spatial	speaks 12:9	336:3,12	225:11	320:16,18
176:2	57:4,5	337:20	309:25	328:16
178:15	61:7,14	specifically	314:3	333:18,20
spawning	272:11,22	12:9 46:24	324:19	340:2
32:1	special	108:18	stabilizatio	343:12,14
47:4,11,16	176:2	131:6,15	n 289:18	stage 23:21
48:7,18	276:23	132:22	stabilize	54:13
49:11	specialist	134:11	311:5	133:9
69:8,16,19	116:25	139:20	stable 19:25	142:18
,22	specialists	175:23	23:13 24:4	149:8,19
70:10,16	270:19	178:22	80:22	215:6
71:3,5,6,1	species	189:23		283:19
1,12	30:21 35:1	197:21		304:25
72:3,15,21	43:25	202:10		305:1,3
		221:17		306:2
		270:8,12		324:12

426				
335:14,19	45:10 47:9	statisticall	stop 71:1	20:15
stages 137:5	59:2 84:16	y 186:8	223:12	61:24
139:11	161:11	statistics	storage	91:15
288:18	162:13	153:2	25:18	139:19
stakeholders	175:17	status	28:15,21,2	194:24
294:16	277:10	266:13	5	195:13,18
336:24	327:9	274:1	29:3,8,10,	208:17
stand 13:17	328:8,9	stay 82:2	11,13,15	209:17
277:10	337:11	92:4,9	51:21	210:15
standard	stated 31:14	195:22	54:9,16,18	268:8
75:9 80:11	46:22,25	201:12	,22 56:3,5	stratificati
126:20	51:22	255:2,4	98:3,14,23	on
standards	61:11	staying 82:5	100:19	146:13,15,
113:13,14	104:9	Stephanie	101:7	24
128:4	122:12	28:6	157:17	stratified
162:15	134:23	steps 341:12	179:13	81:9,19
241:23	136:5	sterile	180:7,22	232:7
336:17	164:1	322:12	193:12	256:9
standpoint	167:17	Steven 3:14	194:11	Strawon 3:14
60:5	168:12,23	Stevens 3:20	195:4,13,1	stream 32:11
304:10,12,	193:12	4:3 15:1	8,21,25	33:9,12
17	267:13	16:19	196:3,6	154:12
staring	292:7	31:7,8	207:24	289:6,9
253:15	317:16	34:8	208:19	290:4,8,12
Stark 223:17	statement	48:11,12	210:8	,16
start 16:8	104:21	49:15,16	211:15	291:3,19
51:12	115:7	70:1,21,22	214:13	299:13
80:13	200:23	71:4 72:13	215:5	301:7,13,1
86:16	263:7,10	104:17	220:5	8,25
145:7	343:17	105:3,4	257:21	311:14
160:7	statements	106:9	258:17,21	streambed
249:19	342:1	108:2	264:9,12	322:3
250:22	states 36:22	112:18	store 208:2	streams
started	129:20	113:11	214:20	193:25
144:2	162:1,4	114:13	stored 21:21	288:13,21
240:23	168:25	144:14	Storing	293:11
starting	170:14	150:25	210:17	294:5
14:12	286:1	151:11	storms	309:4,6,7,
110:8	291:24	154:5,10	258:10	18,21
111:6	315:20	159:17	strateg	310:6,11,1
149:22	325:19	stick 83:10	51:15	4
starts	stations	sticking	strategies	Street
53:12,13	223:8	190:5	51:16 81:6	256:17
85:2	statistic	stir 82:24	161:17	strength
160:19	151:5,12	83:1,10	169:3	57:4
state 43:8	154:17		203:23	309:18
	statistical		224:12	strengths
	186:2		strategy	

427				
123:17	255:15	35:11	185:16	192:16
stress 148:4	262:9	60:18 76:9	187:17	306:5
165:4	276:6	158:21	200:3	summarized
strict 233:7	sub-lethal	substrate	202:4,15	204:3
243:15	119:9	301:14,17	210:6	214:8
strictly	126:4	322:1	219:23	summary
337:8	sublethally	success	282:4,5	16:20
strong 40:4	44:1	193:3	310:5	35:16
52:17	submission	successful	suggested	285:17
176:15	16:24	152:8	61:4 131:9	334:22
230:20	17:23	161:10	140:1	summer 218:7
strongly	18:16	184:20	177:14	Summerfield
218:15	28:14	343:3	180:3	6:18
structure	219:21	successfully	189:13	300:21,22
170:17	234:18	152:4	209:16	339:6,7
171:3	252:5	184:21	219:25	summertime
structures	submissions	succinct	suggesting	44:13
226:13	128:10	182:9	73:3	sump
315:19	submit 44:6	succumb	182:18,19	54:17,21
struggling	124:22	323:5	184:4	supercedes
53:25	197:14	suck 166:22	186:23	246:19,20
studies 32:2	198:10	suffered	suggestion	supper
69:21	244:18	316:6	41:12	243:20
138:12	252:21	sufficient	176:15	supplemental
276:23	341:22	73:15	181:12	11:3 17:21
293:10	342:8	107:4	186:5	18:15
297:3	submits	108:19	201:10,20	20:13
308:13	342:8	111:4	281:21	23:16 28:1
stuff 86:19	submitted	161:18	suggests	35:13
92:4 150:4	19:2 37:20	166:22	210:1	36:23 37:2
sub 33:1	107:21	174:19	267:21	39:4 71:20
37:20	162:2,24	183:11,14	suitability	303:11
Sub-ba	181:11	211:15	31:19	supplemental
290:14	193:7	230:7	suitable	s 36:23
sub-basin	249:17	267:10	47:15	Supplementar
32:16,23	342:19,23	286:14	108:17	y 49:2
144:3	sub-optimal	suffocate	109:18	support 26:7
Sub-basin	190:21	167:4	167:19	34:25
290:14	Subsection	sugar	168:5,14	35:4,20
subject	285:25	82:23,24,2	176:18	167:7
18:22	subsequent	5 83:22	208:12	286:7
116:13	279:23	84:14	293:3,6	300:6,12
182:25	substance	123:1	307:24	322:16
201:21	286:19	suggest	suite 30:11	324:13
252:6	substantial	73:16	sulphate	325:22
	27:24	183:12	159:1	
			summarize	

428				
335:24	279:5,7	205:17	table 9:1	143:11
supported	280:24	survey 70:16	10:1	153:23
20:13	281:2	surveys	14:15,19,2	156:23
27:23 32:2	300:5,15	70:10,24	2 15:3	158:13
supporting	307:20,21	72:25	22:1	187:4
166:13	308:2	survival	160:9,11	194:17
supportive	310:16,20	166:2	244:5,12	195:3
239:25	317:17	199:14	255:5	225:22
291:25	340:25	survive	265:15	232:15
supports	343:9	245:9,16	312:1	258:1,2,3
81:22	surface 18:1	survived	320:24	264:10
99:17	20:21 22:7	169:12	tables 18:14	322:5
267:20	23:5	suspect	tackle	tandem 39:22
341:19	39:18,19	141:16	185:20	tap 146:5
suppose	40:5,10	suspended	tailings	target
142:14	42:11,13	167:16	172:7	296:10
supposed	89:7 93:2	168:3	taking 22:22	targeted
167:13	97:12	216:17	76:8	293:20
168:4	104:23	sustain	110:13	task 76:2
sure 14:10	146:1	49:11	talk 66:19	314:10
38:11,16	166:8,15	sustainabili	109:3,8	tasks 19:8
43:12	169:3	ty 285:22	112:10	35:14
65:22	191:20	sustained	150:8	taught
66:22	192:19,25	94:5 122:8	155:8	328:19
87:13 99:5	212:19	sweep 166:21	246:16,17	taxes 246:13
100:23	213:10	sweeping	250:1	taxonomic
102:6	214:5	165:12	257:24	30:17
109:4	surpass	199:21	302:22	170:23
144:17	164:8	swept 166:5	talked 58:10	TDS 19:22
145:11	surprise	167:8	69:7,8,15	20:1
151:20	234:1	switch 146:6	71:21	22:12,16
156:25	270:14	246:1	136:1	23:9,10
166:19	318:3	synergistic	137:22	53:2 81:20
172:10	surprised	11:10 66:8	144:2	103:24
177:23	177:5	67:5,18	147:2	104:3
187:22	270:15	system 79:5	155:5	123:4
190:5	surrender	164:16,17	195:14	172:14
195:12	248:8	196:7	196:22	205:8,10,1
196:12	surrendered	304:20	219:8	1
198:14	249:11	systematic	303:19,21,	209:2,4,6
212:1	surrogate	330:23	23	210:19
217:2	105:13	<hr/>	talking	212:24
222:12,24	107:2	<hr/>	41:19 58:1	242:20
224:22,24	surrounded	<hr/>	68:3 80:3	243:4
233:16	42:10	<hr/>	86:21	team 15:13
240:3	surrounding	<hr/>	91:18	68:3
261:14	43:25	<hr/>	125:3	
262:12		<hr/>	138:11	

429				
200:14	temperature	161:3	273:14,15	89:14,19
tease 230:25	258:8	192:20	326:3,18,1	90:23
235:21	temporary	202:8	9	91:4,17
tech 47:9,25	54:18	232:15	tested 44:17	92:12
technical	288:23	264:8,15	testing	93:10,11,2
2:13,14,15	335:8	271:25	30:2,10,11	1 94:20
14:18	ten 25:2	279:4	,13,25	95:1,12,24
15:13	52:3 53:6	297:25	44:2,24	97:25
16:9,22	56:6,11	298:4	106:12	98:14
18:18	61:6 86:8	302:4	119:9	99:21
19:12,20	93:1,17,18	304:7	126:4	100:10
26:12 51:8	101:25	305:12	143:8	101:1,8,18
95:20	102:16	325:3	169:9,10,1	102:20,22
124:3	121:10,12,	331:24	5 287:9	104:6
127:22	24 126:21	terrestrial	325:24	109:16
128:10	164:5	94:25	326:2,3,23	111:23,25
136:11	185:12,15,	territorial	tests	112:24
147:21	17,18,19	234:4	126:8,9,20	113:2
161:25	191:5	territories	text 20:12	114:20
163:25	221:21	15:21	257:14	116:17,21
165:3	223:5	50:23	thank 13:19	120:13,23
173:21	244:21	76:16	14:23	124:25
179:12	258:3,24	173:13,17	15:5,10	125:2,24
181:11	tend 299:14	202:16,18,	18:12	126:1,18,2
189:13	307:17	25 216:10	36:1,10,21	4 127:2,3
192:3,9,17	tends 273:16	247:7,15,2	38:22	128:20
196:1	296:5	3 248:3,10	40:16 42:6	130:21
202:10	307:16	249:1,22	43:22 45:7	132:8
203:15	term 90:22	250:13	46:5,19	133:12
204:22	96:8,19	253:12	48:7 49:11	136:5
214:8	97:15,16	258:6	50:20,22,2	138:19
219:21	98:8	259:19	4	144:17,18
221:16	102:18	273:22	55:14,15,1	146:20
227:12	146:21	297:13	6 57:8,10	147:25
234:18	223:18	318:19	59:5,23	149:24
252:10	225:22	329:12	61:17	153:18,21
266:1,4	258:1,23	338:12	62:22	154:1
279:8	terminology	Territories'	63:1,7	155:20
280:23	18:18	s 203:14	65:7	157:1
285:17	48:15	territory	68:8,19,22	158:11
334:23	terms 18:20	13:16	,24 75:25	159:6
335:13	53:4 61:13	247:18	77:19	160:6,15,2
technically	95:15 99:6	264:19	78:25	5
150:2	117:9	336:23	84:11	173:11,14,
305:8	134:14	test	85:23	18 174:23
technology	135:13	38:14,17	86:3,4,8,1	175:13
75:11	149:18	143:12	7,20	177:22
Tee 7:14	158:7	169:14,19	87:2,17	178:3,25
		170:3,4	88:15	179:3,7
				181:3,5,6,
				8 182:1,13

430				
183:2,16	263:12	341:1	108:10	268:22
184:8,9,16	264:24,25	343:2,19	110:25	269:11,12
185:21	265:9	thankful	113:19	271:22
187:20	268:22	189:15	114:24,25	277:16
188:20,24	269:1,4,16	Thanks 16:13	116:17	279:23
196:14,16	270:9,11,2	26:21	120:17	280:4
197:2	4	37:24	121:16	282:4,5
198:24,25	271:16,23	94:19	123:22	299:17
200:4,6,12	272:4	102:21	126:23	300:18
,15,25	273:19	108:11	128:9	305:18
202:17	275:6,24	119:4	131:25	315:5
215:13,17,	276:15	120:1,15	133:11	316:15,21,
20	277:16,18	159:18	140:25	22,23
216:12,22	279:16,17	163:2	141:9	317:17,25
218:1,22	282:8,9,22	179:21	143:18	318:2
219:9,13	284:10,17	181:2	146:16	322:23
220:15	285:5	194:5	147:4	326:5,25
221:6,11,2	295:7,10	196:15	148:19	327:6,9
4 222:3	297:10,14	225:5	149:24	328:22
223:14	298:5,19	319:8	150:14	340:19
224:8	299:20	327:21	151:13,18,	themselves
225:15,24	302:2,7,12	that'd 272:2	19 153:1	187:24
226:3	304:22	that'll	155:15	245:15
227:3,5,8	306:4,20	42:20 89:5	180:2	thereafter
228:22	307:11	97:12	185:19	160:23
229:2,8,12	308:24	146:13	187:19	thereby
230:2,9,13	310:23	213:1	189:22	210:9
231:4,22	311:24	228:21	194:19	therefore
232:4,6,9,	312:9	255:6	195:20	22:3 25:10
13	318:11,14,	325:5	196:9,14	47:11
233:3,22	20,22	that's	198:1	153:15
234:10	319:2,3	43:4,19	200:6	162:21
235:1	320:13,21,	48:1,2,16	208:25	274:24
236:6	22 321:2	51:23 53:7	210:12	288:14
237:13	326:12,13	54:8 55:5	218:20	296:11
239:5,7,22	327:20,25	58:3 59:11	219:15	there'll
240:10,12,	328:1,15,1	60:15,23	228:4	113:20
14,16	6,17,23	64:23	229:25	146:10
241:4,9,13	329:1,3,6,	66:25	230:18	171:16
242:2,10,1	9,13,14,23	73:13	233:13	202:8
5	,24 330:5	78:15	234:10	338:2
243:10,13,	331:10,16,	79:20	240:8	there's
22 244:21	20	82:19 83:9	243:2,5	59:13
245:3,5	333:15,22,	88:11	244:4	60:22
251:4,9,10	23	92:1,18	245:19,21	71:5,7
252:2,16	334:7,12,1	94:4	248:14,19	72:14,16,1
254:11,12	9 336:24	96:10,21	250:6,10	7,25
255:7,12	337:2	100:24,25	252:13	73:5,11,15
259:5,10,1	338:1,3,10	107:14	256:21,23	83:8 85:20
4,20 261:8	,13,23		257:24	
262:5,17	340:7,18		264:7,20	

431				
90:18,19	they'd	tho 94:3	41:22	325:23
92:14	201:17	135:14	42:23	326:17,22
97:3,4	they'll	237:8	43:5,19,22	tissues
101:24	37:15 99:3	thorough	45:7,12	274:2
102:18,19	they're	277:7	46:19,20	title 163:6
109:11	49:10	thoroughly	49:2,3	248:8
112:10	74:22,23	257:17	50:19	285:11
117:2,25	75:7,9	thoughtful	160:24	TK
118:9	88:16,17	82:13	163:3,4	155:8,10,16
140:11	105:21	thousand	184:8,9	Tlicho 6:22
146:22	122:10	93:17,18	185:7	7:2 14:4
151:6	131:9	97:14,23	186:14	102:23,25
157:23,24	157:19	121:11,12,25	187:11	181:7,9
180:2,8,10,14,17	158:1	150:15,19	190:11	227:6,13
195:16,22,23 197:14	174:2	151:7,8,14,15 257:6	197:1,7,13	228:25
200:2	180:10	thousandth	198:24	260:2,5
201:22	185:12	93:1 94:3	199:9	265:10,13
206:21	186:4,25	threshold	215:19	275:8,11
218:9,18	187:2	216:1	216:16	298:21,24
223:11	194:17	287:2,10,13,24 288:7	217:10	300:18
226:14,15	228:6	thresholds	218:22,23	302:4
233:17	237:20	58:14	219:18	319:4,6
234:2	255:22	149:12,18	259:16	330:1,3
236:7,20	256:20,23	162:6	269:3,16	338:25
240:6	272:1	170:20	270:11,24	339:3
243:19	279:20,21	193:4	271:4,21	Tobin 6:16
249:8	300:5	217:9	273:3,4,19	103:3
250:9	309:5	218:17	295:12	104:6,7,19
257:8	313:18	throughout	296:21	106:24
258:11,16	315:3	54:13 71:6	297:10	108:11,12
262:11	323:4,6	81:9 204:2	318:16	109:16,17
281:17	they've	290:16	329:8	111:2,22
299:16	39:18	324:5	337:4	231:8
308:9	51:21	335:6	338:1,2	260:8
309:3,7	53:23	throw 341:1	timeline	265:24,25
316:8	124:14	thus 205:3	111:5,15	266:1
317:18	180:16	207:25	161:20	269:14
318:10	184:20	Tielesh 5:25	timelines	274:3,21
321:25	194:15	ties 129:17	162:6	275:2
322:9	212:3	till 240:21	202:11	283:12,14
323:14,22	250:15	Tim 7:15	timely	319:11
324:22	315:24	39:8,9	162:17	330:8
325:22	thickness		tired 86:18	today 13:22
332:24	268:8		329:2	14:18
333:3	third 327:17		tissue	16:16
thermal	thirty		106:13	51:4,6
180:2,10,24 195:24	150:14,19		184:7,17,19,24	55:8 62:10
	185:14		185:1,4,12	84:9,21

432				
168:23	21:8,10	325:24	transition	treatment
173:19	23:3	326:2,3	24:5	54:23
192:4	125:18,24	toxicology	translation	78:14
203:1,10,1	158:24	12:3	14:2	161:5,7
2 213:1	168:2	272:7,15	334:4,6	327:13
215:14	205:7	278:19	translators	treaty
221:16	216:17	toxit 326:2	18:11,21	246:24,25
227:23	293:19	trace 159:2	334:2	248:9
230:16	touch	track 56:21	transmission	trench
240:5	156:6,11,1	86:6 134:7	146:23	317:19
246:3	6 262:13	182:18	transparent	trends 22:15
258:14	towards	tracking	299:24	169:3
261:24	21:22	52:23	Transport	tribal
262:22	52:23 72:7	56:24	8:14 10:12	246:2,5,6
264:8	tox	58:16	128:25	250:8
306:23	169:9,14,2	Tracy	129:3	tribes
312:16	4 278:19	251:12,17	188:16,19	246:22
321:13	toxi 119:9	254:18	238:10,13	trickle
334:16,21	toxic 11:13	traditional	261:5,8	321:25
to-day 18:23	30:4 51:23	13:16	278:1,3	tried 18:19
Today 334:21	52:3 53:7	17:5,10,11	302:9,11	91:25
today's	57:20	,16 69:1	320:6,9	93:15
252:6	58:3,9	70:4,13	331:13,15	196:13
Tom 3:8	59:21 66:9	71:18 73:1	333:25	305:10
tomorrow	67:10,21	215:2	334:1,11,1	314:24
202:7	143:6,10	253:12	4,17,20,22	327:7
tonight	168:24	254:4	,24	tries 245:20
202:6	169:8,13,2	256:3,5	335:7,15,1	trigger
Tony 8:5	5 205:16	263:25	6,23	51:20
Toogood 2:5	208:21	264:18	336:2,5,8,	148:21
tool 176:22	253:17	298:1,4,10	11,14,20,2	162:6
tools	254:2	trans 14:2	1 337:14	193:4
229:5,23	270:4	Transcript	339:21	218:17
top 56:17	toxicity	10:15	340:8,10	triggered
62:13	30:1,9,11	transcripts	transportati	106:15
105:22	44:2,18	279:20	on	170:15
311:16	52:24 53:4	341:25	335:1,3,10	triggers
topic 57:11	56:6 59:13	342:24	336:4,6,9	45:23
167:10	68:12	transducers	trappers	46:10
207:15	119:9	74:22	292:12	108:4
213:1	143:7	75:17	traps 292:5	148:20,25
332:25	169:10,14,	transfer	treated	149:13
topics	22 170:4	18:3	48:25	161:20
203:20	173:23	103:10	249:1	175:9
total 19:22	208:13	291:25	treating	196:8
	211:22	292:15	77:20	217:4
	269:8,11,2			
	3 270:17			
	273:9			

433				
218:17	176:16	twice 341:9	uncertainty	235:19
trillion	227:15,21	type 40:15	47:18	270:18
249:21	280:12	120:12	195:17	324:16
trivial 83:4	305:17	158:12	213:11	undertaken
trophic	313:5,20	164:19	240:6	16:24
27:15	315:3	167:2	uncomfortabl	17:22
266:13	T'satsaot'in	186:23	e 242:21	30:7,23
trouble	e 248:20	248:1	uncrack	36:23
302:24	TSS 215:25	251:6	84:21 85:5	157:7
trout 47:21	216:5,10,1	types 194:17	underestimat	236:10
105:22	7	218:5	e 205:5	297:4
143:8	217:7,18,2	typewriters	understand	299:12
163:11,21	2	257:6	55:22	undertakes
164:7,22	Tthestonotin	typically	63:3,11	229:20
165:16	e 8:17	92:25	68:4 82:4	undertaking
166:24	244:24	126:9	87:19 92:8	25:20 28:9
169:17	turbidity	276:9	93:16	38:1,2,6,2
172:20	205:19,21	301:11	150:16	4 39:1
185:12	206:1	311:7,8,10	218:6,8	62:11,15,2
187:18	turbulence	typo 163:6	229:5,21	5 63:8,11
190:23	31:9 39:19		246:19	65:4
196:20	166:15,20		247:10	66:21,23
198:3	167:7		257:3	67:1,3
253:14	turbulent	ultimately	262:23,25	68:1,7,14
273:14	325:4	124:16	278:10	87:10,23,2
287:19	turn 15:12	134:12	279:10,13	5 232:17
288:5,12,1	16:7 61:19	170:17	281:10	234:3
6	81:15	209:10	293:10	271:19,20
true 91:4	118:7	212:8	303:5,6	272:1,6,13
92:12	160:21,23	230:24	304:5	273:1
248:21	163:1	234:6	307:3	278:9,16
305:10	210:21	ultraoligotr	314:19	279:10,19,
true s 305:10	243:18	ophic	316:12	22 280:18
truly 334:5	turned	274:1	318:4	281:21,23
trunk 312:21	118:21	un 295:3	understandin	286:3
truth 251:7	turned-over	unable 201:5	g 48:13	undertakings
try 118:7	118:22	unanticipate	145:8	9:3 10:24
185:25	turnover	d 84:18	219:17	11:25
194:7,25	91:22	uncertain	231:2	201:17
196:11	93:21	122:18	understands	202:13
314:8	turns 137:21	214:16	290:6	281:14
trying 52:10	twenty	325:20	undertake	342:1,4
66:17	163:22	uncertaintie	11:1	underway
140:22	twenty-four	s 148:11	25:11,17	109:6
141:2	151:15	224:14	38:15 39:2	undetected
155:3		225:10	52:19 57:3	163:20
			215:11	undone
			222:18	255:23

434				
unfeasible 136:23	unless 120:16	313:2	Van 5:17	24:15
unforeseeabl e 76:17	201:22	useful 199:22	6:24 203:6	verified 107:9
253:1	286:19	235:20	Vangoda 256:16	verify 36:25
Unger 6:2	unlikely 73:24	user 127:13,16	Vangorda 86:24	104:15
11:19	314:20	users 127:9	121:3	Veronique 6:10
86:15	316:12	290:24	Vangulck 5:18 203:7	285:12
87:22	unprepared 283:24	usual 191:10	variability 159:20	319:15,16
88:6,14	unsettled 249:9,10	usually 279:20,21, 22	290:9	versa 69:19
89:14,15	unsure 166:3	UV 75:3	variable 21:6	version 18:25
90:23,24	unti 232:17		variables 197:15	29:10,16
91:17,18	untouched 167:14	<hr/> V <hr/>	variance 148:11	vertical 21:9,13
93:11,12	168:4	vague 45:21	varied 21:23	41:4 96:20
94:20,21	update 25:4	valid 56:14	variety 26:6	146:24
95:12,13	updated 18:24	validation 104:21	51:3	via 299:13
97:25 98:1	29:10	Valley 1:2,9	334:24	viability 295:15
99:21,22	46:12	13:11	various 19:7	viable 208:19
101:1,8,9	96:23	181:16	28:2 32:2	257:18
102:9,10	162:23	228:12	103:21	vice 69:19
179:10	updates 19:3	250:3	107:25	vicinity 205:19
181:3,4	149:17	value 15:15	173:3	Victoria 246:9
221:14	268:19	34:24	288:13	view 32:1
223:14,15	upon 13:1	82:12	varying 24:21	152:15
224:20	17:15	163:16	vast 253:8	153:11
225:3,15,1	86:10,11	176:3	VC 48:7	157:21
6 227:3,4	129:8,9	186:2,8,9	VCs 35:4	223:11
255:1,7,12	174:3,13	245:16	211:10	327:20
,13 259:10	200:17,18	263:25	241:24	views 244:16
262:4	218:19	283:5	velocities 288:3	279:14
263:12,13	243:24,25	298:1,10	vent 103:22	342:11,13
274:16,25	268:2,15	valued 17:7	venture 167:21	Villebrun 8:17
275:5	273:11	35:21	vergion 29:10	244:12,22, 23,24
297:23	284:21,22	178:16	verification	245:3,25
298:18	343:21	215:2		Villeneuve 4:23
319:1	upper 21:18	295:16		
329:22	23:9 79:14	298:13		
333:8	90:11,13	values 21:16		
338:22	94:8 97:12	176:21		
unimpeded 286:15	146:8,10,1	262:22		
unique 81:5	4	264:18		
91:12,16	uranium	298:4		
92:6,20				
93:7				
122:14				
256:11				
unit 48:25				
73:14				

435				
Virgil 3:15	217:20	21,22	40:6 43:10	120:4
virtue 79:4	walls 61:21	195:1,2,3,	45:5 46:9	121:4
84:17	62:2	8,11,13,18	48:3 49:5	123:14,18,
visible	63:4,19	,21,25	50:5	21
74:10	64:4 85:13	196:3,5,6	51:1,14,16	127:11,12,
vital 307:11	warmer 79:19	221:19	,21,24	13 128:3,4
voice 248:13	98:12	225:17,19,	52:4,17,22	130:4
voices 343:9	169:20	21 257:21	,23	131:7,9
volume 31:22	warming	258:15,17,	53:9,17	134:7,14
104:4	226:18	21	54:10,14,1	135:15
207:24	warning	264:8,12	5,18,21	136:20
210:4,8	33:15 35:6	275:1,3	55:10,24	137:10,15
211:15	49:23	325:3	56:20,21	138:20
volumes	105:6	wastes	57:1,5,15	139:19,24
192:21	161:20	156:23	58:9,11,16	140:7,14
211:17	164:13	158:12	,22	141:5,22
212:14	warnings	wastewater	59:20,21	144:9,18
Von 312:21	58:23,25	137:14	60:12,24	145:20
316:7	warrant	253:18	61:2,23,25	146:1,12
votes 249:3	73:16	254:2	62:3,4	147:3,11
	warrants	watching	64:6,14,15	148:10,11,
	199:25	58:20	,22 73:22	20 149:14
	washroom	276:5	74:1,3,7,8	157:10
<hr/> W <hr/>	241:3	277:15	,14,15,20,	158:5,20,2
wa 64:8	wasn't 14:25	water 12:4	23	1 160:20
wadable	145:25	15:25	76:11,14,1	161:5,7,9
160:2	245:12,18	16:18,23	8,19	162:1,3,8,
wade 4:15,22	280:22	17:2,7,12,	77:2,10,12	16,23
160:3	waste	22,24	,14,16,21	163:1
Wah-Shee	28:15,21,2	18:1,2	78:1,2,6,1	165:6
1:13	5	19:1,7,15,	1,12,21,23	166:15
wait 196:9	29:2,8,9,1	18	79:3,9,13,	169:3,4,16
waited	1,15	20:5,8,15,	21,22	,17,19,20
114:25	98:2,3,14,	17,21	80:9,16,21	171:9
Walbourne	22	22:7,10,11	81:5,16	173:22
5:15	100:4,17,1	23:4	82:1 84:22	174:10,17
walk 226:24	8 101:6	24:14,20,2	88:20	176:24
walk-away	150:17	5	89:7,13,16	177:3,8,10
223:1	154:24	25:1,4,13	90:10,17	,12 178:21
226:24	156:18	26:9,11,15	91:14	179:14
227:2	157:16	27:1,6,9	94:16,24	180:6,21
wall 64:7,8	158:19	28:4,14,23	95:1 96:7	189:5
82:18	179:13,17,	29:17	98:4	191:21,24
83:4,9	24	30:2,3,5,6	99:11,14	192:19,25
	180:3,7,22	,15	100:18	193:2,8,13
	193:11	31:1,19,23	102:15	,21 195:10
	194:10,18,	33:20	103:10,13,	198:11,16
		35:9,10,15	22 104:23	202:24
		,18,25	113:13	203:3,12,2
			117:21	1,23 204:1
			119:23	205:7,18,2

436				
4 206:10	273:14	39:19,23	38:15,23	138:11
207:16,18,	276:6	40:5	51:12	140:10,16,
21,25	278:21	42:6,21	63:7,18	22
208:4,5,6,	286:14	166:5	66:18,21	141:2,18,1
7,9,12,17,	290:5,7,17	ways 108:8	83:18	9 142:1,25
19,23,25	291:3,5,8,	132:8	94:17	151:20
209:1,5,10	16 303:23	315:8	110:22	152:9
,16,22	309:3,12	weather	129:5,6	153:5
210:2,4,6,	311:10	37:11	143:1	156:23
9,10,15,17	313:24	we'd 55:11	151:19	163:18
,21,24	314:4	86:8 87:14	155:1	172:3,10
211:1,3,4,	321:25	139:11	181:1	173:1
11,22	322:22	152:9	212:25	178:20
212:14,15,	325:1,8	243:14	243:19	181:1
18,21	327:6,7,13	254:22	254:22	187:4,13
213:2,6,10	328:7	271:20	271:20	190:4,5
,13,15,16,	332:5	282:1	282:1	195:3,12
17,19,22,2	335:8	333:13		203:12
5	337:15	317:2	well-being	211:18
214:4,6,21	water-level	319:2	250:2,4	212:1,6
,25 215:5	290:11	322:23	well-	215:10
217:23	waters	325:25	establishe	218:8
220:3,10,2	162:19	wedded	d 105:19	219:15
4 222:17	177:6	154:13,14	well-known	224:3
223:10	194:1	week 37:14	75:11	226:21,23
227:14	210:19	70:16	Wendt 4:10	227:15,18
229:8,17	212:19	201:16	we're 13:15	228:18
230:8	247:21	246:7	14:12 15:8	236:25
231:20	286:19	281:23	41:19	243:16
232:1,7	287:1	weeks 37:12	52:10 53:6	247:16
234:19,23	337:22	341:21	55:5,7	249:1
241:23,24	water's	Wek'eezhii	58:1 63:16	253:19
242:19,25	64:12	25:13	64:3 77:5	257:24
243:1,4	Waters	26:11,15	83:17	258:2,3,10
245:7,9,12	337:7,10	27:1 35:25	87:13	264:8,10,2
,15,16	watershed	100:18	90:25	2 270:2
246:2	34:21	144:9,17	94:22 95:8	277:15
247:24	198:2	162:3,25	98:7,20	284:5
248:18	213:8	180:6,20	99:15	297:2
250:11	waterworks	193:7	100:2	302:5
253:11,14	335:9	195:9	101:10,11	314:17
256:6	wave 31:9,22	198:11,15	102:12	316:11
258:18	40:7,13	332:5	108:1	321:11
262:14	165:12	welcome	109:4	322:15
264:17	166:9,14,1	13:12	110:8,9	324:13
267:24,25	9 167:7	244:15	113:23	343:9
268:10,15,	199:20	Weledeh 14:5	125:23	we've
21	waves	we'll 36:11	127:12	15:16,17,2
270:3,16			137:21	2,23 43:20
271:7				51:4
272:8,16				58:9,10

437				
75:14 77:2	whenever	172:20	283:22	217:18
78:10	175:9	187:19	wind 20:10	219:5,7
81:13	whereas	198:3	24:1	220:7
84:23	256:20	199:12,15	39:14,20,2	231:24
90:5,18	257:3	253:14	3	237:21
92:22	whereby	Whitford 8:5	40:1,4,24	238:1,17,1
93:8,9	296:16	whole 93:6	41:3,5	9 269:21
98:6 101:3	whether 12:6	217:13	42:20 89:9	270:7
104:5	47:19 48:6	321:19	94:2,4,5	273:6
108:25	52:22	324:15	122:3,6,7,	278:8
110:3	58:15	326:19	8 218:25	280:15
123:9	69:20	327:11	219:1,3	295:18
124:10	80:22	who's 231:20	winds 42:5	309:5
132:1,6	84:25 92:3	312:21	92:25	330:14
133:5	109:11	343:14	winter 206:2	332:8
140:24,25	110:1,21	width	213:18	wording
141:7,21	111:13	154:13,14	218:10	38:12,16
142:13	112:11	309:18	306:23,25	67:15
147:2,22	126:6,8	Wielen 6:24	307:2,6	work 15:22
152:4,24,2	131:23	wiggle	308:10,13	16:23,25
5 158:4	143:1	312:20	309:9	17:1,22
159:19	161:11	wildlife	wintering	18:16
168:22	166:19,21	12:3,7	72:21	23:20 25:9
180:3,21	167:18,21	27:10	wish 192:7	27:24
209:15	168:14	176:19	wishes	35:11
220:18	172:11,16	250:13	161:23	66:20 69:2
223:16	174:8	256:5	280:3	72:7
227:11	175:11	270:17,19	Witherly	110:1,8
230:15	183:10,14	271:9,11	4:11	148:3
233:24	191:13	272:7,10,1	withing 49:5	180:13,15,
237:17	195:17,23	4,20	woman	18,20
238:22	198:13	278:19	250:8,20	214:19
245:10	199:3,17,1	336:17	wonder 43:13	215:11
256:7	8 201:7	willing	156:25	229:25
262:10	214:4	172:23	wondered	237:6
279:8,15	219:2,3	253:21	310:9	243:3
297:24	246:24	Williston	wondering	267:17
314:22	272:9,18	6:13	39:23	279:15
315:6	308:2	Wilson 6:20	40:14 42:3	281:21
322:5	310:9	265:24	44:4,15	284:8
324:5,7,8	323:4	270:9,10	48:5 57:21	286:2
whatever	324:6,22	271:5	74:9,12	293:5
84:24	340:11	272:4,5	140:16	294:2
151:3	white 196:19	273:12	155:10	318:10
190:15	whitefish	275:25	184:3	334:6
309:8	47:21	276:18	185:3	337:23
Wheeler	105:23	277:4		343:8
203:6	163:11			worked
Wheler 2:8	165:16,24			126:15
				304:9

438				
305:13,14	201:8,9,15	314:15	198:10	zooplankton
312:23	202:9	316:5	215:23	30:21 44:9
313:1	241:18	329:17,19	262:22	169:25
317:2	279:24	338:17,19	304:5	170:6,8,11
workers	280:1	yesterday	343:8	,12
250:17	281:14	86:19	Yvonne 1:12	171:3,8,17
working	342:23	179:11	306:18,19	,20
111:19	wrong 82:16	243:19	308:6	172:2,6,12
120:11	196:9	256:7		,17,21
180:9,10	280:21	312:16	<hr/>	173:24
185:10	314:12	yet 37:16	Z	
230:17	wrote 246:9	43:9 167:6	Z2P 121:4	
235:19	<hr/>	168:5	Zachary 4:13	
works 335:1	X	170:21	Zajdlik 5:14	
workshop	X-axis 22:13	172:15	51:9 61:19	
41:11	23:2	241:4	65:9,11	
109:2	<hr/>	254:18	66:4 67:17	
267:16,21	Y	262:16	68:10	
341:15,18	Y-axis 22:12	267:3	203:5	
workshops	23:4	290:22	273:23	
110:25	year's 220:5	304:9,19	274:8	
302:21	yellow 21:9	YKDFN 7:17	zero 257:10	
world 121:13	Yellowknife	10:6 81:25	Zimmerman	
246:22	1:23 76:22	228:3	5:7	
247:2,3	Yellowknives	315:22	zinc 326:21	
276:10	13:16	318:22	Zoe 7:2,4,6	
313:3	28:12	319:2	181:8,9	
worldwide	68:23,25	YKDFN's	182:13	
124:15	69:2,6	315:16	183:16	
worry 223:19	70:5,13,23	yolk 167:5	227:8	
258:16	71:1,17	Yonge 5:21	229:2	
worse	73:20	young 4:13	230:2	
142:2,3	75:25	171:11	231:4	
317:15	77:19	yourself	zone 21:1	
Worsley-	78:25	125:5	28:4 44:1	
Brown 3:2	84:11	you've 75:6	121:4	
worst 211:21	86:2,3	119:5	169:7	
wrap 242:9	144:20	128:2	170:1	
writ	179:4,6	134:23	207:13	
248:9,11	221:8,10	141:15,23	269:7,18,2	
writing	248:21	143:4,6,7	2,24	
241:17	259:24	147:8	270:3,8,18	
244:19	260:1	148:13,15,	278:22,23	
257:7	274:11,13	16	zones 21:2	
written	297:18,20	150:3,17	205:20	
	311:25	152:14	206:2	
	312:6,8	196:22	241:23	