



# Fax

Organization:

Lowe Arrolini

Fax:

920-4761

Phone:

July 24/01.

Date:

Subject:

Cdn Zinc time-lines

Pages:

3

, including cover

Hi Louie -

Response to your

July 17 ltr. Do you want  
electronic copy? I can send  
along -

MT

- July 26, 2001 called @ 1:50 July 25, 2001  
and left a message.

FROM:

ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION  
INDIAN AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS CANADA  
BOX 1500  
YELLOWKNIFE, NT X1A 2R3

TELEPHONE: (867) 669-2589  
FACSIMILE: (867) 669-2701

ok



Indian and Northern  
Affairs Canada  
www.inac.gc.ca

Affaires indiennes  
et du Nord Canada  
www.ainc.gc.ca

P.O. Box 1500  
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2R3

*Your file - Votre référence*

*Our file - Notre référence*

Luciano Azzolini  
Environmental Assessment Officer  
MVEIRB  
Yellowknife, NT

July 24, 2001

SENT BY FAX: 920-4761

Dear Louie:

Thank you for your letter of July 17, 2001 expressing the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board's (the Board's) affirmation of the need for an effective and efficient process for the Canadian Zinc Corporation current environmental assessments (EAs). I have had an opportunity to further discuss your request with representatives of the other responsible ministers (RMs) and would like to provide the Board with the following response.

The RMs are concerned with the Board's decision to place these EAs "on hold for thirty days", without providing further clarification. While in our letter of July 6, 2001, we expressed concerns in meeting the timelines for the two EAs, our intent was not to delay the review process and we will be continuing with our analysis of the material provided to date.

We are pleased to submit our suggestions for adjustments to the timelines for the reviews. However, we do not want to encroach on the Board's responsibility to develop its own work plan for the EAs. As the process used by the Board to make decisions on the appropriateness of Information Requests (IRs) is not known to us, we are putting forward suggestions for proposed blocks of time that could be considered for several important phases of the EAs rather than specific calendar dates..

We feel that a minimum of three weeks should be allocated for responses to IRs and a minimum of four weeks should be allotted for detailed technical reviews. We would like to stress that the time period for the technical reviews should commence only after ALL the IRs have been responded to. If an IR response takes longer or shorter than the estimated response time, then the timelines can be adjusted accordingly. In short, we are suggesting to the Board that the timelines should be flexible to accommodate certain events.

Canada

*Printed on recycled paper - Imprimé sur papier recyclé*

The RMs also wanted to stress to the Board that there may still be deficiencies in the information base after the responses to the IRs . The Board may want to consider building in a contingency for a deficiency response following the end of the technical review. We hope this information will assist you in developing an adjusted work plan for these reviews.

Sincerely,



David Livingstone,

Director

Renewable Resources and Environment

cc. Dave Tyson, DFO

Anne Wilson, EC

Chuck Blyth, NNPR

Brett Hudson, RWED

1 Mary T. Mary feels they have answered the request. She gave the blocks of time as appropriate. They felt the time lines as provided are adequate for the work planning.

1 Don't intend in sending another one out will not place calendar dates on any letter.

1 The letter is approved by all RAM's.