

Pre-hearing Conference Meeting Notes - De Beers Snap Lake Environmental Assessment Project

Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board

*March 26th & 27th, 2003
Explorer Hotel, Yellowknife*

March 26th, 2003 – Day 1

Morning

1. Opening Remarks

Vern Christensen, Executive Director of the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB or Review Board) gave the opening remarks on behalf of MVEIRB. He welcomed the pre-hearing conference (PHC) participants and conducted a general review of the pre-hearing conference agenda for the next two days.

2. Facilitator Opening

John Donihee, facilitator of the pre-hearing discussions, outlined the intent of the proceedings for the pre-hearing conference, making special note that the objective of the first day was to clarify the status of the issues with the Parties as best as possible and that process issues would be mainly addressed on Day 2 of the PHC.

Participation in the pre-hearing process was welcomed and it was stated that no Party is bound by discussion in the PHC. It was also stressed that as time will be limited to five days during the actual hearings Parties may need to be selective with presentations of most pertinent issues. In any case, the Review Board will continue to review evidence on the entire record critically.

A review of the events to date was conducted, as well as a review of some fast approaching dates and deadlines such as the following:

- **April 3rd, 2003:** Deadline for parties to file, in writing, their intent to participate in the public hearing;
- **April 7th, 2003:** Deadline for parties to provide a list of topics for which they intend to provide presentations for the public hearing;
- **April 11th, 2003:** De Beers' public hearing presentations due;
- **April 17th, 2003:** Other parties to the EA public hearing presentations due;

- *April 28th to May 2nd, 2003*: Public hearing at Northern United Place; and
- *June 27th, 2003*: Submission of MVEIRB's Report of EA to the Minister.

John Donihee highlighted that the Review Board must decide whether the Snap Lake De Beers project will contribute *significantly* to environmental impacts or social concerns. Parties were encouraged to consider which of their issues presented in their technical reports could be handled at a regulatory stage, which are not important in terms of *significant* impact, and which needed to be brought forward to the public hearings.

Summary of Discussion Following Opening Remarks

- Clarification that the PHC was meant to help identify the status of issues, not to debate technical details;
- MVEIRB is not in a position to have major new filings of technical reports but that further communication to solve issues prior to the public hearing between the Parties and the proponent is encouraged with the request that MVEIRB is updated upon the status of resolved issues. The MVEIRB will provide confirmation on filing requirements next week;
- De Beers will work as best as they can to continue to resolve issues with the Parties on an on-going basis continuing after the public hearings

3. Overview of Process

Glenda Fratton gave a presentation outlining the environmental assessment (EA) process. The presentation was provided in PowerPoint format and can be found on the MVEIRB website at: ftp://www.mveirb.nt.ca/Registry/EADeBeers/Pre-hearing_conf/

Summary of EA Process

EA start → EA terms of reference and work plan → three rounds of information requests (IRs) → technical sessions → technical reports/addenda → pre-hearing conference → public hearing → report of EA submitted to INAC minister → minister approval → EA end.

Issues Synopsis Table

An issue synopsis table was introduced during the facilitator's opening, noting that it would be filed to the public record; it was prepared at the staff level to provide a snapshot status report issue-by-issue. The intended purpose of the issue synopsis table was to kick off PHC discussions regarding whether or not all issues and concerns were captured accurately, and to identify issues of priority.

The column headings of the issue synopsis table were explained, and the general approach to the preparing the table was outlined. The MVEIRB's technical consultants worked to compile sections of the issue synopsis table, based on their discipline expertise.

4. Presentations on Issue Synopsis Table

MVEIRB consultants who worked to compile sections of the issues synopsis table gave the following presentations, highlighting issues and summarizing the general methodology for developing the table. PowerPoint presentations for 4.1 and 4.3 to 4.7, are posted to the MVEIRB website at ftp://www.mveirb.nt.ca/Registry/EADeBeers/Pre-hearing_conf/

4.1 Hydrogeology, Surface Water Quality and Fisheries Issue Synopsis

Presenter: Neil Hutchinson, Gartner Lee Limited on behalf of MVEIRB

Presentation Summary

It was noted that a large number of the issues appear *unresolved* but are in fact *in progress* and De Beers are working to address issues. There were a number of differences of opinion regarding issues (i.e. importance, uncertainty, interpretation of guidelines or thresholds, potential for effect and nature of effect). Seventy-five (75) issues were documented by Parties however, many concerns overlap.

Resolution of 'generic' issues may take care of multiple issues at once. Some issues (i.e. connate ground water composition) should be resolved prior to assessing effects (in this case to aquatic life). Some of the issues are pushing the limits of technical understanding and there may be limited evidence in order to resolve issues (i.e. unknown toxic concentration of beneficial ions or effects of the interaction of multiple stressors). Where possible, Parties should strive to clarify their understanding of the above types of issues to the Review Board.

Five major themes emerged from the issue synopsis table, with respect to hydrogeology, surface water quality and fisheries:

1. Inputs to Waste Stream;
2. Treatment or Management;
3. Physical/Chemical Response of Snap Lake;
4. Biological Response in Snap Lake; and,
5. Cumulative Effects

Much time will need to be spent at the public hearings on ground water, lake response and biology. Cumulative effects may also take more time. Parties were encouraged to build strong cases for the Review Board that will indicate what it will take to resolve issues, backed with supporting evidence for significant impacts, as well as to report anything that can be learned from Diavik and Ekati.

Summary of Discussion Following Presentation

- On the issue synopsis table, if experts of the Review Board have given an issue *resolved status*, but the Parties do not agree, the Parties still have the opportunity to make their argument to the Review Board. The Review Board will consider all information presented to date.
- It would be useful for the Review Board to provide their working definitions (as per terms of reference and use throughout this EA to date) of terms like 'multiple stressors', 'cumulative effects', and 'synergistic' (any terms that have a tendency to be used out of context) and provide information related to how the Review Board looks at these terms with respect to impacts.
- It was clarified that 'hydrogeology' would be the major topic heading and that for Parties raising issues it isn't necessary to identify their issues under the presented subheadings within the issues table.
- De Beers will do their best to speak to the contentious issues identified by experts of the Review Board. It is De Beers' intention to give presentations regarding the outstanding issues and high priority items, followed by question periods with the plan of following up with unanswered questions.
- The public hearing date, time and location has been advertised. Time will be made for public presentations of a more general nature. It was suggested that a good opportunity for presentations from members of the public, more general in nature

would be within the slotted time for the opening statements (limited to approximately 15 minutes each). Time will be managed by the facilitator and chair as fairly as possible and time will be made for public members that attend throughout the sessions to give presentations.

- De Beers will take into consideration the concern that Parties may have questions that extend beyond the daily scheduled discipline topic. De Beers was asked to consider having their full contingency of experts present for all days of the public hearing.

4.2 Geotechnical Issue Synopsis

Presenter: Mark Watson, EBA Engineering on behalf of MVEIRB

Presentation Summary

There are geothermal issues, some of which refer to soils and seepage. All issues deemed unresolved or in progress at this time are pertinent to the North Pile.

There is a strong component of hydrogeological issues, some with short-term impacts and some long-term.

There are two water quality issue components: 1) water management relating to the underground mine and 2) water management relating to the North Pile.

Overall under geotechnical issues there are seventeen issues of which nine are unresolved. Three of the nine unresolved issues, could be broken down into three subject areas:

1. geothermal analysis;
2. cryo-concentration; and
3. seepage from the North Pile.

Many issues, according to the experts of the Review Board, are stated to be *in progress*. Review Board consultants would like to further discuss some of these issues with some of the parties. On the cryo-concentration and geochemistry items Review Board consultants will be looking for some feedback as to how INAC sees these components affecting the big picture effect.

Regarding seepage issues, there were originally some concerns about seepage from the North Pile; De Beers upgraded the perimeter ditch design and have gone to a collection and treatment system that has diffused a lot of the issues of direct seepage.

Afternoon

4.3 Air Quality and Waste Issue Synopsis

Presenter: Glenda Fratton, Gartner Lee Limited on behalf of MVEIRB

Presentation Summary

- One of the parties had requested that an itemized list of “to-be” buried waste materials. A list of typical buried waste materials was provided in one of De Beers technical memos. One of the parties (Yellowknives Dene First Nation - YKDFN) indicated it recognizes the memo has been provided and that the content of the list will now be looked at in more detail.
- There is preference by at least one of the parties for a dedicated engineered site for the landfill (within the North Pile).
- Biological remediation (as proposed by De Beers) has been shown to be unsuccessful under Arctic conditions.
- Commitments are vague regarding emission tracking and ambient air quality monitoring.
- Cumulative deposition of particulates issue remains.

4.4 Vegetation Issue Synopsis

Presenter: Glenda Fratton, Gartner Lee Limited on behalf of MVEIRB

Presentation Summary

Vegetation issues fall into reclamation or revegetation issues as follows:

1. Whether or not vegetation will be monitored for contaminant uptake;
2. The success of revegetation (non-native species invasion and lack of monitoring programs related to success criteria and the uncertainty of ecological capability of reclaimed landscapes); and
3. Details for the Abandonment and Reclamation plan should not be delayed to the regulatory phase.

De Beers recently submitted a Preliminary Mine Closure and Reclamation Plan, in which items 2 and 3, above were addressed to some extent. Written reports by the parties did not indicate whether these items were still an issue. INAC indicated that they are still reviewing the A& R plan and may bring issues to the hearing.

4.5 Wildlife Issue Synopsis

Presenter: Robert Anderson, Gartner Lee Limited on behalf of MVEIRB

Presentation Summary

The major issue categories were identified to be:

- Appropriate Valued Ecosystem Components (VECs) and Emphasis: some species (i.e. furbearers) were not included as VECs and of the VECs considered there was question as to whether or not appropriate concern was given.
- Baseline Data: general lack of adequate information (i.e. caribou, wolverine and grizzly bears); sampling design and effort was not sufficient to collect necessary information; not all available science was utilized; not all available traditional knowledge was utilized (especially in instances when science information needed gaps filled in).
- Mitigation Planning: there was general concern regarding lack of details and that it is difficult to determine plausible success if the details are not filled in (i.e. attractants for wolverines).
- Environmental Assessment Methods and Conclusions: there was concern regarding the lack of comparison regarding alternative impacts; impact ratings (should have been higher) were not reasonable; and data were not available to support the confidence ratings (seemed to come down to difference of opinion here).
- Cumulative Effects Assessment: data were inadequate to make a reasonable assessment; and not all available data sources were used; not all influencing factors were considered (i.e. wolverine mortality).
- Monitoring: there was general concern over lack of detail for planned monitoring; and the question of whether or not monitoring will be able to identify problems.

Summary of Discussion Following Presentation

- De Beers was concerned that GNWT's issues were not captured appropriately. The GNWT's overview summary (in their technical report) indicated the GNWT appeared to be content with the wildlife work.

4.6 Social/Cultural/Economics Issue Synopsis

Presenter: Roy Ellis, Ellis Consulting by MVEIRB and Richard Roberts, The Praxis Group on behalf of MVEIRB

Presentation Summary – Economic Focus

The social and economic impacts overlap to some extent.

For the purposes of identifying issues for the issue synopsis table only the technical reports and De Beers' technical memos were reviewed at this time; therefore the issues raised at the technical sessions are not included, but will be reviewed and considered in preparation for the hearing.

There are three main areas for Economic and Social Issues:

1. The need to quantify and maximize impacts of employment and business activity in the NWT;
2. Immigration to the NWT and associated impacts on infrastructure; and
3. Employment impacts on communities, families and individuals.

A significant issue is that without quantifiable estimates (targets) impact analysis is difficult.

Presentation Summary – Socio-economic/Cultural Focus

- Cultural and traditional issues: traditional land and resources; cultural and language issues; traditional knowledge; and work-life schedule issues.
- Community focused issues: infrastructure; community support and development; and health, education and family types of issues.
- Minesite issues: health and safety; direct flights; and power.
- Consultation issues: concerns that the Mining Management Advisory Committee (MMAC) might not be able to represent the range of community concerns.
- Cumulative Effects: the question of how to determine impacts without knowing the numbers of community services and how they'll incorporate all of the projects; and the question of what happens in the case of multiple closures when more than one mine closes at once.

- Process Issues: the concern regarding lack of baseline data and analysis; study region inclusion; and lack of ability to determine effects.
- Limitations to lack of information regarding what the potential mitigation will look like include lack of knowledge regarding: Impact Benefit Agreements (IBAs); Socio-economic Agreements with GNWT; and lack of established partnerships that will support a number of activities.

Summary of Discussion Following Presentation

- The Review Board will be advised of the concern that the Socio-economic Agreements may take place after the public hearings. In the past Socio-economic Agreements and IBAs have not been placed on the public registry as these agreements are private and confidential. The Parties do have the option to provide evidence singularly to the Review Board.
- Canadian Arctic Resources Committee (CARC) indicated that issues raised by this party at the technical sessions are not included in the issue synopsis table (CARC did not file a technical report). It was agreed by MVEIRB staff that these issues would be included in the next version of the issue synopsis table.
- De Beers stated that the De Beers Fund technical memo was filed on the public registry on February 28, 2003.
- Lack of details regarding mitigation measures and targets set by De Beers (as done in the past with BHP and Diavik) around training, employment, business and purchasing (an issue presented at the technical sessions in Nov/Dec 2003) remains unresolved. It was requested, at the technical sessions, that INAC and GNWT also respond to the above. To date INAC has responded with a letter but GNWT has yet to do so.

4.7 Cumulative Effects Issue Synopsis

Presenter: Heidi Klein, Gartner Lee Limited on behalf of MVEIRB

Presentation Summary

In general, issues fall into two broad categories: adequacy of baseline data and the environmental assessment itself.

Summary of Issues:

1. Water: interaction of effects from the project itself; and lessons learned from previous projects.
2. Wildlife: questions raised about adequacy of data to make reasonable assessment; and question of whether or not all available data was used (i.e. hunting/trapping records).
3. Socio-economics: adequacy of assessment data and analysis; consideration/inclusion of monitoring data from BHP and Diavik; and cumulative effects in general.
4. Air: cumulative deposition of particulates from BHP and Diavik.

Summary of Discussion Following Presentation

- It was recommended that De Beers and GNWT review a recent report titled “Cumulative Environmental Effects of Oil and Gas Activities” to see if there may be anything relevant to capture for the Snap Lake EA. The report is comprised of over four years of studies of relevant information relating specifically to caribou.
- It was confirmed that it is the MVEIRB’s intent to discuss cumulative effects issues under each discipline topic at the public hearing
- With respect to qualifying experts, it has not been the Review Board’s practice to date to qualify or swear witnesses in, as in a court of law. The Review Board would like to see CVs prior to the public hearing and if there are issues of whether witnesses are qualified during the public hearing, it will be dealt with then and there. The Review Board wants to hear what the public think and feel and to ensure that a clear understanding of what people are saying is achieved. People are also welcome to state their positions. The process will be fairly informal.

March 27th, 2003 – Day 2

Morning

5. Recap of Day 1 and Introduction to Day 2

John Donihee provided a recap of Day 1 and summarized the issues and conclusions to date. On Day 2 discussion regarding general procedural issues, a variety of miscellaneous issues, and proposed changes to the public hearing agenda took place. MVEIRB will circulate a revised draft public hearing agenda April 1st or 2nd, 2003.

Summary of Day 2 Discussions

- With respect to the issue of allocating time for the presentations, the Review Board will try to ensure that the Parties have 20 to 30 minutes per topic. In terms of the layout of presentations, it is up to the Parties to make the presentations in a fashion that will make the most sense (and strongest case) to the Review Board.
- The Review Board's intention is to provide 20 minutes or more to the Parties presenters and questions will come after each presentation. Regarding the Parties' submissions of public hearing presentations, the Review Board wants a clear indication of what the issues are, and why the issues remain and generally what the tone and content of the presentation will be. Verbatim written script of the presentations is not necessary. Powerpoint presentations used at the hearing are not required nor are closing statements are not necessary for the April 11 and 17 submission deadlines.
- The purpose of giving information regarding public hearing presentations prior to the public hearings is to make the process as fair as possible for all participants and to have an understanding of what people might say in order to help everyone prepare their presentations.
- After each public hearing presentation, Parties will have the opportunity to ask questions first and the Review Board will ask questions last.
- Concern was raised that the technical format of the issues synopsis table is very complex and difficult to relay to communities in plain language

- Things will be organized as best as possible but the attempt has been to place 'breathing space' within the public hearing agenda. There is no guarantee that events will be held at the exact time allocated.
- The cumulative effects issues are slotted for discussion under each of the major themes. There is an opportunity to bring up any 'big picture' issues within the opening and closing statements.
- It was reiterated that it would be useful to have all De Beers' experts present for all days of the public hearing. For example, there is overlap between geotechnical and vegetation/wildlife issues with respect to dust discussions.
- De Beers put in a verbal request for two hours for the opening day to ensure all Parties have a good understanding of the project and resolutions that have been made; one 20 minute presentation on geotechnical issues; one 30 minute presentation on hydrogeology issues; two 30 minute presentations (one on physical / chemical responses and one regarding biological response) on April 29th; one 30 minute wildlife presentation on April 30th; one 40 minute presentation on May 1st regarding socio-economic issues; and a 20 minute presentations for May 2nd but subject to revision based on the topics that arise for this day. The initial request will adapt according to the amended agenda.
- If members of the public (including community elders) attend the public hearing and want to give presentations by signing up at the door, they are welcome to do so. In order to be fair, any public presenters will also be subject to potential questioning regarding their presentations. Parties with direct involvement and developed technical or detailed issues are expected to present their issues prior to the public hearing as per the April 17th deadline.
- A proposal for holding a caribou workshop in Lutsel K'e was presented to De Beers by YKDFN, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation, North Slave Metis Alliance and Dogrib Treaty 11 Council. The date for the caribou workshop is not yet set, but was proposed for April 14th. MVEIRB and Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development (RWED) committed to having staff attend the caribou workshop. There are deadline issues with respect to getting the results of the caribou workshop on the public record in order to be considered by the Review Board as the end of May is the closing date for submissions of public review material. Depending upon when the workshop is held, the Review Board will look at options for a way to accommodate review of the results of the caribou workshop. It would be a good idea to have a person recording the results of the workshop for submission to the public record. The

general purpose of the workshop will be to discuss unresolved issues (some brought up at the technical sessions) and the caribou movement through the mine site.

- The intention for keeping the public registry open until the end of May was because the Review Board wanted to make sure that transcripts would be in. Commitments made at the public hearings will be filed. For the purposes of reviewing resolved and unresolved issues, it will be left up to the Review Board to review all of the evidence before them and decide whether they feel issues are resolved or not
- It was requested that the February 24th MVEIRB letter regarding process be updated and that the April 17th deadline be added.
- The goal for the public hearings is to have transcripts available during that week but the Review Board cannot commit to that as of yet due to budgeting issues. Transcripts may be made available to Parties at a cost of a couple of dollars for each page.
- There will be oral translation (Chip and Dogrib) at the public hearings but transcripts will be in English only.
- At least one evening session (maybe two, but to be confirmed) will be held during the week of the public hearing in order for the general public to attend and make presentations, statements and ask questions. It was emphasized by Lutsel K'e, YKDFN and Dogrib representatives that Elders should be able to attend and participate in the entire hearing proceeding, and not just the evening session(s).
- Due to its bearing on the assessment of socio-economic impacts of the Snap Lake project, the recommendation was reiterated from Day 1 and the past technical sessions in December 2002 that the Socio-economic Agreements and IBAs cannot be used in deliberations, unless they are filed to the public registry (and it is not expected that they will be). YKDFN indicated that they would like to address social concerns at the public hearing, and social questions that have gone unanswered.

6. Summary of Pre-Hearing Conference Commitments

Several commitments were made by the MVEIRB over the course of the pre-hearing conference proceeding. The MVEIRB committed to:

- Clarifying cumulative effects definition;
- Clarifying information filing requirements;
- Providing an update of February 24th process clarification letter;

- Providing revised and Review Board approved public hearing agenda;
- Providing PHC meeting notes (prepared by GeoNorth), and aiming for middle of next week;
- Providing PHC powerpoint presentations on the MVEIRB website; and,
- Having Review Board staff attend caribou workshop.

The pre-hearing conference was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Attachment I: Participants List

Day 1 and 2 Participants for Pre-hearing Conference, March 26 & 27, 2003 De Beers Snap Lake Diamond Project		
#	Name	Organization
1	Vern Christensen	Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB)
2	Alan Ehrlich	MVEIRB
3	John Donihee	MVEIRB
4	Glenda Fratton	Gartner Lee Limited for MVEIRB
5	Heidi Klein	Gartner Lee Limited for MVEIRB
6	Robert Anderson	Gartner Lee Limited for MVEIRB
7	Neil Hutchinson	Gartner Lee Limited for MVEIRB
8	Roy Ellis	Ellis Consulting for MVEIRB
9	Mark Watson	EBA Engineering for MVEIRB
10	Louie Azzolini	Terra Firma Consultants for MVEIRB
11	Richard Roberts	The Praxis Group for MVEIRB
12	Martin Haefile	MVEIRB
13	Sherry Sian	MVEIRB
14	Yvonne MacNeil	Department of Justice, GNWT
15	Fraser Fairman	Indian & Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)
16	Sevn Bohnet	INAC
17	Buddy Williams	INAC
18	Kevin O'Reilly	Canadian Arctic Resources Committee (CARC)
19	Bob Turner	North Slave Metis Alliance (NSMA)
20	Kris Johnson	NSMA
21	Jason LePine	Northwest Territory Metis Nation
22	Mark Dahl	Environment Canada (EC)
23	Elaine Blais	Department of Fisheries & Oceans (DFO)
24	Rick Schryer	Golder Associates Ltd.
25	Pat Tones	Golder Associates Ltd.
26	Margo Burgess	Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)
27	John Ramsey	NRCan
28	Robin Johnstone	De Beers Canada Mining Inc. (DBCMI)
29	Colleen English	DBCMI
30	Peter Homenuck	DBCMI
31	Eric Groody	DBCMI
32	Deborah Archibald	RWED - GNWT
33	Lionel Marcinkoski	RWED - GNWT
34	Jason McNeil	RWED - GNWT
35	David Lemon	Interested citizen
36	Steve Wilbur	Enrix, Inc. for Dogrib Treaty 11 Council (via phone line)
37	Jean Teillet	Pape & Salter for Dogrib Treaty 11 Council (via phone line)
38	Tim Byers	Yellowknives Dene First Nation (YKDFN)
39	Rachel Crapeau	YKDFN
40	John Drygeese	YKDFN
41	Isadore Tsetta	YKDFN
43	Michel Paper	YKDFN
44	Florence Catholique	Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation

**Pre-hearing Conference
De Beers Snap Lake Diamond Project**

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Day 1: March 26, 2003

No.	Name	Organization	Contact Number
1	Heidi Klein	GLL	403-262-4299 x 122
2	YVONNE MACNEILL	DOS	867-669-6919
3	Fraser Fairman	DIAND	867-669-2587
4	Serv Bohnet	"	688-2696
5	Buddy Williams	DIAND	867-669-2697
6	Karid O'Reilly	CARC	867-813-4715
7	Bob Turner	NSMA	867-873-9176
8	Kris Johnson	NSMA	867-873-9176
9	JASON LEPINE	NWT METIS NATION	873-3435
10	MARK DAHL	Environment Canada	669-4734
11	Elaine Blais	DFO	669-4912
12	Tim Byers	YDFN Land & Env. Comm.	(204) 886-4642
13	Margo Burgess	NRCan	613-996-9317
14	John Ramsey	NRCan	(613) 947-1591
15	Jason McNeill	RWED GNWT	(867) 920-8071
16	LIONEL MARCINKOSKI	RWED - GNWT	867-920-3118
17	Deborah Archibald	RWED - GNWT	867.920.3343
18	Gilken English.	DBCM	867-766-7321
19	Eric Greedy	"	
20	Robin Johnstone	"	867-766-7300
21	Rick Schryer	GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.	1-306-665-7989
22	Pat Tones	Golder Assoc. Ltd.	403-297-5600
23	Alan	MVEIRB	
24	Ray		
25	Mark		
26	Vern		
27	John		
28	Glenda		
29	Louie		
30	Richard		
31	Steve Wilbow		
32	DAVID LEMON	Interested Citizen	705-524-2192
33	Peter Homennick	Tennisplan - DeBeers	
34	Martin Haefele	MVEIRB	
35	Sherry Stan	MVEIRB	@
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			

**Pre-hearing Conference
De Beers Snap Lake Diamond Project**

Day 2: March 27, 2003

New People on Day 2

No.	Name	Organization	Contact Number
1	Florence Catholique	Wesley Kie	—
2	Rachel Crepeau	YKDFW	—
3	Michel Payer	"	
4	John Dwygese	"	
5	Isadore Tsetta	"	
6	Jean Teillet	Dogrib	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			