

**Jay-Cardinal Project EA1314-01**  
**Yellowknife Community Scoping Session**  
**January 7, 2014**

The following is a summary of the topics raised by community members at the Yellowknife community scoping session.

**Water quality**

- Impacts of upstream flooding from 2 m elevation increase in Duchess Lake
- Erosion of from pumping, de-watering and diverting water from Lac du Sauvage through streams to Paul Lake and Lac de Gras
- Concern with explosives residue and nitrogen which may build up in remaining ponds within Lc du Sauvage drained area
- Water quality in the holes, or deep areas in Lac du Sauvage during operations

**Dust emissions**

- Impacts from greater amounts of dust from increased traffic along Misery Road

**Caribou**

- Impacts to caribou from combined traffic increase along Misery Road from Jay-Cardinal Haul trucks with winter road operations
- Caribou migration and movement across Misery Road will be more difficult with increase in traffic along Misery Road
- Main movement for caribou is along both sides of Lac du Sauvage, how

**Alternatives – energy**

- DDEC should explore alternative energy sources, with Diavik wind turbines as an example
- Need an overall emission reduction plan for the minesite
- Consider ways to reduce emissions

**Environmental Agreement**

- Will the environmental agreement continue?

**Socio-economic**

- Too many positions hired from southern Canada

Jay- Cardinal Project Community Scoping Session, Yellowknife Jan 7, 2014. Summary

- Subcontractors do not seem to be bound by local hire provisions in the agreements
- Need more promotions for northerners for supervisor and management positions

## **Jay-Cardinal Project EA1314-01**

### **Yellowknife Technical Scoping Session**

**January 8, 2014**

The following is a summary of the technical scoping sessions held in Yellowknife on January 8, 2014. Please note the information from the session will be considered by the Review Board in the creation of the draft Terms of Reference. A draft Terms of reference will be issued for comment at a later date.

## **Contents**

Infrastructure .....	1
Water quality, quantity, and levels.....	2
Aquatic environment .....	3
Wildlife .....	4
Cumulative effects .....	5
Management Plans .....	7
Alternatives and Alternatives Analysis.....	7
Closure and Reclamation .....	8
Socio-Economic.....	9
Miscellaneous .....	9
Next Steps .....	11

## **Infrastructure**

### Waste Rock Piles

- Concerns were raised about the surface footprint of the waste rock piles on land from Jay and Cardinal and that the alternative of filling in one or both of the pits could be an alternative.
- The developer responded that information on this alternative will be provided in the Developer's Assessment Report (DAR) however, the developer does not consider this as a viable alternative at this time.

### Roads

- Concerns were raised that the information provided in the developer's presentation doesn't contain an accurate representation of the actual number and length of roads required to

develop the Jay and Cardinal pipes. These additional roads include roads to pump stations and along pipelines.

- The developer stated that the final road layout has not been developed at this time and that the DAR will contain detailed plans that are made in conjunction with Aboriginal input.

#### Pumping

- Pumping scenarios – questions were raised about what the final pumping plan (layout, roads, etc.) would look like.
- Developer indicates a detailed plan will be provided in the DAR

## **Water quality, quantity, and levels**

#### Unresolved – narrative statements for water quality at closure

Yellowknives – 3.3.3.1 of the draft TOR contains a narrative statement for the end goal of water quality at closure. What is it? Want it to be similar to pre mine.

Developer – water quality will be adequate to sustain and support the same population as there was before.

#### KLI – water quality – level of detail

- It was noted that water quality in the developers Terms of Reference (TOR) uses 8 bullets to describe the level of detail required. However, other EAs of similar projects had far more detail, such as 3 pages of specifics. The concern was raised that without a thorough listing of the details required to assess water quality that there is uncertainty if the DAR will adequately address the KLI.
- Developer – the details are implicit in the 8 bullets but if parties want a higher degree of detail they can be included the TOR.

#### Water Quality – Mercury

- It was suggested that the TOR contain specific detection limits for mercury.
- Developer agrees and suggested the appropriate detection limit is the lowest detection limit.

#### Water quantity

- The TOR should consider the quantity of water required at closure for refilling the pits and how this may affect other water users in the Lac de Gras area.
- Developer - agrees

#### Water quality – saline water

- Concerns were raised that there may be issues with saline ground water entering the pits and requiring treatment.
- The developer indicates that this shouldn't be a concern based on local geology and hydrogeology and that the DAR will contain information on this including modelling that will consider the potential for saline ground water.

#### Water Quality – filling pits

- A concern was raised that when it comes time to filling the pits with water that residual blasting material (nitrates and nitrate) and fines could impact water quality.
- The developer indicates that there may be residual blasting residues and this will be managed and monitored as the pits are filled in a controlled manner. Further, if monitoring indicates there is a water quality issue that this would be managed and mitigated.

#### Water levels

- Concern about what the effects of lowering the water level of Lac du Sauvage may have on the south east outlet into Lac de Gras. This includes water levels, flow volumes, exposed shoreline, impacts on caribou and water circulation patterns in Lac de Gras
- Developer indicates that detailed information will be in the DAR

#### Water - Flow

- Questions on whether an alternative for flow diversion at Lac du Sauvage was considered. Specifically, diverting all flows in Lac du Sauvage around the north end and into Duchess Lake and Lac de Gras.
- The developer indicated that alternatives were considered and that information on alternatives will be in the DAR.

#### Water quality - parameters

- It was noted that the draft TOR contains a list of parameters for monitoring the aquatic environment that includes, but is not limited to, MMER and CCME. It was noted that because of other mining activity in the vicinity that specific effects have been noted which include increases in total nitrogen and chlorophyll A. It was suggested that these two parameters and other parameters found to be of concern from other mining activity in the area are monitor and the that the TOR specifically indicate as such.
- Developer agrees.

## **Aquatic environment**

### KLI – aquatic life/aquatic ecosystem

- There was a discussion of whether aquatic life should be a Key Line of Enquiry. Participants requested that aquatic life be moved from a subject of note to a key line of enquiry. Further, it was requested that benthics and plankton be explicitly included.
- The developer did not object to aquatic life as a key line of enquiry and that it could be included in water quality or as a stand-alone KLI.
- The developer and meeting participants agree with this approach.

#### Fish - suckers

- It was noted that ephemeral water courses are habitat for suckers. It was requested that ephemeral water courses be mapped and mitigation proposed.
- Developer agrees.

#### Fish – habitat compensation plan

- The issue of a fish habitat compensation plan and when it will be developed was discussed.
- The developer indicates that the plan is being developed in parallel with the EA process and that FN and Aboriginal participation in the creation of the plan is a fundamental part of the developer's approach to developing the plan.

#### Habitat compensation plan, fish out plan

- It was recognized that the habitat compensation plane and fish out plan may not be finalized during the period of the EA. However, it is required that these plans be given consideration during the EA.
- Developer – Conceptual plan can be provided during the EA and will have DFO and community input.
- It was noted that clarification is required regarding the definition of conceptual.

## **Wildlife**

#### Wildlife as a KLI

- It was suggested that grizzly bears, wolverine and Species at Risk are added to the Wildlife KLI.
- The Developer agreed.

#### Caribou and infrastructure

- There was a discussion regarding the routing of roads and pipelines as they relate to caribou and caribou movement, specific concern was raised about the narrows associated with the outlet of Lac du Sauvage.
- The developer indicated that the routing of roads and pipelines was not finalized at this time and that the DAR will contain more detail. Further, that the final routing of roads will be planned with input from Aboriginal groups.

### Caribou – efficacy of mitigation measures

- It was noted that the efficacy of caribou mitigations, such as ramps, is uncertain.
- Developer – there is no easy way to quantify the efficacy of certain mitigation measures. But the DAR will speak to the degree of uncertainty surrounding certain mitigation measures. Further, the use of the winter road and its effects on caribou will be described.

### **Cumulative effects**

There was a discussion regarding cumulative effects in general and what are reasonably foreseeable projects. It was noted that many future project are inherently difficult to quantitatively address in a cumulative effects (CE) assessment due to uncertainties in project design. For instance, the developer is proposing to use a quantitative CE assessment for wildlife that is spatially explicit and must have specific geographic areas associated with it. Without this information assumptions must be made that are often wrong.

However, it was noted that excluding large future projects that currently don't have a high level of detail associate with them may lead to erroneous conclusions about CE. Large uncertain projects must be considered.

It was noted that a way to deal with the issue of a lack of quantitative information about future developments can be solved by a qualitative approach to CE assessment and that this approach has worked in the past.

A resolution on how to approach CE assessment was reached by proposing that the DAR contain two CE assessments:

- one quantitative CE assessment
- a scenario based CE assessment that contains 2 or 3 scenarios

It was suggested that by using two or three scenarios to characterize future scenarios that include large, but uncertain, projects could be presented in the DAR. Further, it was understood by all that these future scenarios would have less quantitative detail.

It was noted that this approach was used recently in the NWT by Conoco Phillips in the Sahtu region and that this example of a scenario based CE analysis would be provided to the Review Board. Further, it was suggested that an additional example from Saskatchewan would be provided to the Review Board.

- The Developer agreed in full to point 37 (IEMA) in the Online Review System regarding CE.
- That offsets can be used in mitigation CE.

### Monitoring protocols

- It was suggested that standardized monitoring protocols be used.
- Developer agrees

### Cumulative effects as a KLI

There was a discussion on whether cumulative effects should be a KLI. The reason provided was that due to relatively high levels of industrial development in the area of Lac du Gras and Lac du Sauvage, in conjunction with climate change, and the significance of caribou, fish and water to Aboriginal groups that CE should be a KLI. It was noted that the importance of CE is sufficient to warrant a stand-alone section and that this approach brings a different light to the subject matter.

- Developer agrees that CE is important and could be a KLI. However, disagrees with the approach of having a stand-alone section. Developer argued that CE will be included in each KLI. Separating out CE muddies the waters and could be redundant.
- It was agreed by all that each KLI will deal with CE and that the DAR will also contain a stand-alone section for CE that will contain a summary of CE information from other sections in the DAR.

### CE – baseline

- Clarification was requested regarding what is baseline.
- Developer – for project specific impacts baseline is the current conditions at Ekati. For CE baseline is prior to large scale development in the area.

### Caribou – CE and geographic scope

- Geographic scope for CE should include the annual habitat range for caribou
- Yes, for Bathurst caribou.

### Caribou – CE and geographic Scope

- What is the zone of influence for this project? Wildlife (caribou) and cumulative effects will require a large area for the Bathurst caribou?
- Developer responded and stated that it depends on the topic area. For wildlife the zone will be well documented in the DAR and it is not finalized yet. Further, for cumulative effects all past development in the Bathurst range will be reasonably accounted for and any reasonably foreseeable developments. Fisheries – will include all upstream and downstream affected lakes

### Caribou habitat and CE

- It was asserted that the seasonal ranges/habitat of caribou have different values as they relate to the wellbeing of caribou, such as calving grounds, and this should be recognized. It was asserted that the time between calving to rut and the associated habitat is the most important.
- Developer – Didn't agree fully but took note of this view.

### Focus of CE assessment - Caribou



- It was stated that the ultimate outcome of the CE assessment should be the impacts on caribou population not habitat.
- Developer – will access both using the best of their tools

#### Caribou – mitigations

- The topic of existing caribou crossings and their efficacy was raised and that the effectiveness of these mitigations should be assessed in the CE assessment. The impetus for the stress on these mitigations is that this proposed project makes a 75 km barrier to the movement of caribou.
- Developer – This will be in the CE assessment and can be clarified. Accepts the comment.
- The developer stressed that a CE response framework is a GNWT initiative.

#### Tibbit to Contwoyto Winter Road

- How will the Contwoyto winter road be accommodated by the mine plan for the Jay and Cardinal project? Are there other developments to the north that may use the road and will this contribute to cumulative effects?
- The developer states that the Contwoyto winter road would be accommodated for in the mine plan. Further, that the cumulative effects assessment will include the Contwoyto winter road

#### Contwoyto winter road

- Tibbit to Contwoyto winter road should be included in TOR. After Diavik closes all use of the road is DDEC.
- Developer – agrees.

## **Management Plans**

- The topic of environmental management plans and what aspects of these plans will be reviewed in this assessment was raised.
- The Developer indicated that the results of the existing plans at Ekati can, and will, be used in this assessment.

#### Public engagement

- The Review Board requested that the developer provide a public engagement plan and a record of engagement that conforms to the WLWB guidance document.
- Developer – yes

## **Alternatives and Alternatives Analysis**

#### Alternatives analysis as a KLI

- The issue of whether alternatives analysis should be a KLI was raised. It was noted that alternatives assessment is important because it is an effective way of determining impacts and

significance. Further, that having a consistent, transparent, systematic and robust way of assessing alternatives is preferable. It was suggested that a way to accomplish this is through the use of a multiple accounts analysis. This method has benefits such as getting stakeholder buy in. If this approach is used it should include cost benefit analysis.

- Developer – Did not fundamentally disagree but suggested there may be other ways to accomplish the goals of a multiple accounts analysis and that the developer would do a suitable comparison that will be systematic, open, transparent, and consistent. Economics will be included to the extent that it's pertinent to the assessment and may be qualitative or quantitative. Will include environmental trade-offs. The developer committed to meeting with IEMA to develop a discussion paper that will be submitted for discussion and to the Board.

#### Alternatives – water

- There was a discussion on alternatives to managing waters associated with the dewatering and diversion of waters. It was requested that additional information on alternatives be provided in sufficient detail to allow reviewers to understand the developer's rationale for deciding on why to not use certain alternatives. Further that the DAR should contain details on the impacts associated with the alternatives.
- The developer agrees

## **Closure and Reclamation**

#### Temporal scope – narrative or numeric

- The topic of how long the temporal scope should be was raised. It was noted that in another recent assessment of diamond mines that proposal to drain a lake (Kennady Lake) had a temporal scope of 75 years.
- Developer responded by proposing that the goal of closure is the reestablishment of fish in Lac du Sauvage. Hence, a narrative statement for closure is preferable over a numeric statement.
- Parties agreed that the successful reestablishment of fish populations similar to pre development in Lac du Sauvage is an appropriate narrative statement for the temporal scope.

#### Closure and reclamation – re-watering of lake bed

- The issue was raised that during the re-watering of the drained Lac du Sauvage that terrestrial vegetation would be submerged. It was suggested that the Developer specifically address the consideration of the vegetation on the lake bed in closure planning.
- Developer agrees.
- Closure and reclamation plans needs to be a focus of this project. Doesn't need to be a KLI but it is a valuable. Requested a robust conceptual closure plan.
- A request was made for the DAR to include a recap closure of the current mine and how it's progressing.
- The Developer agrees

## Socio-Economic

### KLI – human environment

- human environment should be elevated as a KLI.
- No comments from Developer. The Online Review System document has a response.
- socio economic should be elevated to a KLI. How is this project impacting the people and communities, such as: community health, changing demographics, ability of company to provide employment, etc.? Further, that a generation of data from FN members who have participated in the mining sector at large, and at Ekati, should be brought to this assessment. It is acknowledged that this type of assessment of northern communities may need info from the government
- The cumulative socio economic impacts have not been addressed. The developer needs to do this type of research.
- Developer – disagrees that this burden should not be on the developer's shoulders, it's too broad.
- to expand the CE assessment on socio–economics to include items such as human health.
- KLI - Impacts to traditional hunting resulting from effects to caribou. Use input from community sessions, use qualitative assessment.
- significant public concern about caribou and human use of caribou
- It was noted that there are two historic permanent communities in NU that are now seasonally used by people and hence, should be considered by the Developer.
- Developer – agrees that these two seasonal communities will be included as potentially affected communities.

## Miscellaneous

### Noise and dust

- Noise and dust from the Jay and Cardinal project will generate new sources of dust and noise in new areas.
- The developer indicated that an assessment of noise and dust will be done and it will be in the DAR.

### Archeological

- Rising water levels in affected lakes may impact archeological sites and has the developer studies and assessed this.
- The developer states that an assessment of this will be in the DAR.

### Valued Ecosystem Components

- it was requested that an explicit list of valued ecosystem components (VECs) be provided.

- Developer – agrees and will use the existing Ekati list of VECs as a starting point to develop a list of VECs for the Jay and Cardinal project

#### Metasediments, Acid Rock Drainage and waste rock

Concerns were raised about material from the Jay and Cardinal pipes that have the potential for acid rock drainage.

- Developer stated that the current method at Ekati for managing metasediments is to place them on land with 5 m of cover. This is also the proposed method for the Jay and Cardinal Project. However, these sediments can be disposed of underwater and has been done in other instances.

Acid rock drainage (ARD) – questions on whether Lynx could pose acid rock drainage issues.

- The developer indicates that this will not be an issue as Lynx does not have Metasediments (the rock that contains minerals that can cause ARD) and that the granite rock at Lynx has negligible to no ARD potential.

#### Parties requested clarification on the terms KLI and Subject of Note.

- Review board stated that a KLI indicates a higher level of priority and emphasis, more detail in the DAR, and a higher level of scrutiny during the assessment.
- Subjects of note still require a substantial level of effort but not as much as KLI.
- That how the KLI is dealt with in the DAR is not important so long as they get the level of effort required.

#### Define Significance

It was requested that in the ToR the developer be required to indicate what criteria and rationale are used to determine significance. What is the threshold for significance? Viewpoint expressed that narrative statements may be appropriate.

- Developer – agrees and will provide rationale as to why an effect is below a threshold.

#### Assess impacts by development phase

Clarification was sought as to whether project effects are assessed by project phase.

- Developer – Yes, project effects are assessed by project phase and this approach will be reflected in the DAR.

#### Failure modes effects analysis

Failure modes effects analysis could be part of the alternatives analysis. The TOR has a list of accidents. Participants agree with what the developer proposes.

- Developer – will do a risk assessment. A more detailed analysis will be done during project design.

## Next Steps

- Draft Review Board Terms of Reference will be issued at the end of January
- Reviewers will have 2 weeks to provide comments with the developer responses following
- Final Terms of Reference by the end of February
- DAR submission - the developer is aiming for the summer of 2014, however, a specific date cannot be provided at this time.

**Jay-Cardinal Project EA1314-01**  
**Behchoko Community Scoping Session**  
**January 14, 2014**

The following is a summary of the topics raised by community members at the Behchoko community scoping session.

**Compensation, benefits, employment**

**Caribou**

Harvesting – compensation

- The issue of compensation for the loss of the ability to practice traditional caribou hunting. The loss also included trapping fox and harvesting muskox.

Decrease in caribou – human health impacts – cost of living - compensation

Concerns were raised that the decrease in caribou numbers, change in migration patterns and change in location of caribou leads to a loss of a traditional lifestyle and traditional diet (caribou). Community members assert that the changes to the caribou are due to the combined effects of the diamond diamonds. This loss of traditional lifestyle and diet is affecting the health of the people because the alternative is food from the grocery store which can lead to multiple health effects. This switch in food and impacts on health is exacerbated by a lack of physical activity associated with a traditional lifestyle. This also impacts the socio economic wellbeing of the community as food from the grocery requires money and the prices are high.

**Benefits**

Distribution of benefits

- Concern that economic benefits from the mine flow south and that insufficient benefits stay in the north to compensate for the loss of caribou and the permanent scars left on the land.
- Community members raised concerns that when the mine is operating resources are taken and that the compensation to the Tlicho people is not adequate.
- Concern that the benefits gained from taking resources from Tlicho lands are not distributed equitably or proportionally to the Tlicho people.

### Benefits – community infrastructure

- Community members raised the topic that compensation could take the form of infrastructure within the community.

### Reclamation – permanent scars and compensation

- Concern that there is little recognition of the permanent scars left behind and the effects this has on Traditional lifestyles and that compensation is not provided specifically for this.
- Concern that after mining there are permanent scars left behind that the Tlicho people are not compensated for.
- Concern that when the mine closes there will be permanent scars on the land and that compensation and benefits to the Tlicho people should take into account the permanent nature of the loss of land and water.

### Employment – past performance

Concern was expressed that the past 15 years of Ekati has not lead to meaningful employment to the Tlicho people. Meaningful employment includes:

- Opportunity for promotion
- Training and skill opportunities

### Employment – Criminal record

Many people are concerned that criminal records prevent access to employment and because of this the community is not able to take advantage of the potential benefits from the mine.

## **Wildlife - Caribou**

### Caribou - movement

Concern that the existing mine, in conjunction with other existing mines, and the proposed mine expansion is a barrier caribou migration at a critical point in the migration route.

### Cumulative effects - caribou

Concern was expressed that the cumulative effects from the existing mines in conjunction with the proposed mine expansion and other projects is having, and will have a larger, a significant impact on caribou migration and numbers.

## **Infrastructure**

### Winter Road – contamination from spills and littering

Concern about the potential for contamination of the environment adjacent the winter road from spills, littering, and debris.

### Mine site roads – caribou movement

Concern that disturbance from the roads may cause caribou to avoid the area which could lead to an alteration in the migration route and stress on the animals. The disturbances from the road include: dust, noise and smell.

## **Socio-Economic**

### Employment

Concern and questions were raised regarding the employment requirements for contractors at the mine and whether they are the same as DDEC's.

### Employment – managing wages – community health and wellness

Concern that Aboriginal members who enter the wage economy may not have the skills to manage their income and that without these skills poor decisions are made when spending wages. This is a real hindrance for the Tlicho people to realize benefits from the mine. It was noted that the quality of life (poverty, health, mental health, etc.) has decreased since the diamond mines opened.

### Community wellness

Concerns were expressed about community wellness and that it has decreased since the diamond mines opened. Community wellness issues include:

- Homelessness
- Addictions
- Mental health
- Unemployment

### Discrimination

Concern and apprehensions were expressed that employees using Aboriginal language(s) at the mine may face discrimination.



## **Water Quality and Fish**

### Water quality

Concern that past, present and future mining activities may negatively affect water quality which in turn will impact the use of the area for traditional purposes such as fishing.

### Fish and Fish Habitat

Concern was raised that the proposed draining of the lake, and effects to adjacent lakes, will impact fish and Fish habitat including food sources of fish (plankton, benthics).

## **Miscellaneous**

### Alternative methods

Concerns were raised that the proposed method of draining Lac du Sauvage may have significant impacts. Community members want to explore alternatives to draining the lake that may have less environmental damage and want the DAR to contain sufficient information for them to understand the impacts from alternative methods.

### Past environmental performance of the mine

The issues associated with the past environmental performance at the existing mine site, and other diamond mines was raised. Community members wanted the EA process to consider the past performance.

### Reclamation Planning

Concern was raised that reclamation plans must be considered during the EA

### Waste Management

Concern that all hazardous and non-hazardous waste must be managed appropriately (see link to past environmental performance). This concern was raised because community members raised undocumented assertions of waste buried onsite that should have been shipped out.

### Climate change

The issue of climate change was raised and that it is impacting the caribou, the land, and the water. People want the EA to include climate change.

**Jay-Cardinal Project EA1314-01**  
**Lutsel K'e Community Scoping Session**  
**January 16, 2014**

The following is a summary of the topics raised by community members at the Lutsel K'e community scoping session.

**Water quality and quantity**

- Upstream and downstream impacts to water quality and quantity need to be considered
- Impacts to Coppermine watershed
- Groundwater flow study must be completed
- How will climate change be considered?
- Lowering and raising water levels, impacts to fish feeding areas
- Water level rise (Duchess Lake) will impact fish populations,
- Changes to mercury levels in water from flooding and nutrients in water from mining
- Warming of water due to climate change
- Worried about water not being safe to drink
- For de-watering and re-watering, need independent scientists to review, not just DDEC consultants

**Scope of assessment**

- Temporal scope must include closure to the point where lake trout are re-established in Lac du Sauvage
- Include exploration and drilling programs within the scope of development
- What is baseline, pre-1998 before all diamond mines or present day?

**Air quality and visual impacts**

- Air emissions and dispersion of contaminants needs to be considered
- Dust on lichen will impact caribou health
- Exhaust from mine vehicles and dust is deposited on the land
- Visual disturbance from waste rock piles

## **Caribou**

- Caribou research must include important caribou crossings
- There are important caribou crossings in the land between Lac de Gras and Lac du Sauvage
- Will the absence of the lake (drained Lac du Sauvage) have an impact on migration and movement of caribou
- Mitigation needed for caribou movement across roads, boulders along Misery Road cause injuries to caribou
- Caribou do not migrate the same way since the mines were developed, now it costs more to hunt because hunters need to go further
- Increased noise impacts to caribou from project; disturbance
- Will caribou get stuck in the drained lake-bottom?

## **Alternatives**

- Need to consider alternatives to draining a large portion of Lac du Sauvage
- Include alternatives ( dykes, road locations, diversions and drawdown scenarios, waste rock piles) as a key line of inquiry
- Are there alternatives to draining Lac du Sauvage? Daivik-style dike around pits
- Ring dyke alternative rather than draining lake

## **Environmental Agreement**

### **Socio-economic**

- The well-being, economic and otherwise of the residents of the NWT is a guiding principle of this environmental assessment
- A generation of people have come of age since Ekati began, we should be able to learn from that
- Socio-economic issues must be a key line of inquiry
- Community health aspects must be considered in a more comprehensive manner
- We care about what is happening in the communities impacted by the mine
- DDEC needs to take responsibility for mine-related social issues
- DDEC should work with the Lutsel K'e Health and Social Services Department to find solutions
- Social problems such as alcohol and drugs are an issue
- Social impacts from mining – lack of resources to deal with these impacts
- People are sick because they don't get to eat caribou and don't spend time on the land hunting caribou
- Concerns with human health, mental health, drug abuse
- Need jobs within the mining industry
- Need to hire more people from Lutsel K'e

- Distribution of benefits needs to be equal
- Benefits such as jobs and contracts needed
- Benefits – want legacy benefits, funds need to come to the community
- Lutsel K'e needs to see benefits from the mine expansion – IBA
- Concerns with past performance of Ekati mine, training was not done, studies were not done and there is the feeling that promises were broken
- Training, especially for youth is important
- Education and training for youth are required in order to benefit from the mine
- Employment and training are key issues
- Information on jobs and apprenticeships are needed
- When studies are being done involve youth
- Barriers to employment – criminal records

### **Cumulative effects**

- Must be a key line of inquiry
- Needs to include entire species range for caribou, not just seasonal range or project site specific in cumulative effects assessment
- Cumulative effects from additional mine to community wellness

### **Wildlife (other than caribou)**

- Birds, musk ox, wolverine all need to be considered in the EA of this project

### **Fish and aquatic life**

- Fish habitat compensation plan needs to be included at the environmental assessment phase because it is a key means for mitigation of project impacts
- The fish out and fish habitat compensation plan should be a part of the environmental assessment
- Draining a large portion of Lac du Sauvage will have a dramatic impact on all marine life, could affect fish migration routes
- Water in drawdown area not suitable for fish
- There are many fish in the portion of Lac du Sauvage that will be drained, how will you salvage them all
- Fish out plan – what happens to the fish, re-locate, salvage?
- Flooding Duchess Lake will result in changes to fish, release of mercury and other substances
- Suggest visiting Lac du Sauvage this summer and begin harvesting fish before the lake is drained

### **Tibbit to Contwoyto Winter Road**

- This EA must consider the road because DDEC will be the only user of this road once the Jay-Cardinal project begins operations
- Use of the winter road needs to be part of this project

### **Damage to the land**

- Compensation is required for damage to the land
- Will berries be safe to eat?

### **Public hearings**

- Want public hearing in Lutsel K'e for this project (suggested multiple times)

### **Closure**

- Planning for closure needs to start right away
- DDEC states that fish will return to Lac du Sauvage after lake is filled up. Will this work?