

Sherry Sian

From: Laurie Stephenson [lstephenson@wascomgt.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2003 1:09 PM
To: Sherry Sian
Subject: Re: Information Requirements for Consolidated Goldwin Ventures DAR

Received Fax Copy;

How do you want me to proceed? change the relevant pages and re-submit or the Whole report?

Some questions on what you want and answers how you want that inputted into the report.

Section A-1 (page 1)

1. The target location is presumed to be under the small pond therefore no clearing would be required as the drilling will be from the shore and my government maps indicate no flora in the vicinity. To be safe I can put in a paragraph of general practice procedure?

2. The shoreline or general area land. I am not sure what you are asking for here. Tundra, open barrens, tiaga forest?

3. Yes

Section A-1 (page 2)

1. By the drill.

2. The fuel barrels will be the first containment unit. and the "carrier" lined with an liquid imiscible barrier. DFO seemed to understand this and it has been an accepted practice throughout the NWT. The actual unit has not yet been decided on and in the longrun may be a doubled walled unit. The idea is to ensure there is no spillage of any type and to have a spill plan in place as per DFO regulations to address the issue.

How do you want me to address these issues - just add these comments as paragraphs? expand on them or what? I assumed that some historical knowledge is inherent in the participants. Please outline what detail you want.

Section B-1 (page 3)

1. & 2. Cons GoldWin has undertaken 3 exploration projects in the areas described, however as outlined in the text the consultants have been involved in mineral exploration programs in the north for over 25 years. One of the Directors ran the 1996 program in the same area plus other projects, I have monitored drilling exploration projects throughout North America in many more stringent environmental regimes ie California's Mohave Desert.

Preliminary drilling operations in the north are not that different or complex as one's throughout the rest of the country. So there is no reason to even hint that we don't have the experience to operate. I think as professional engineers we have an obligation to protect and operate safely in any environment we go into, I think that professional obligation should be respected by the regulatory bodies.

The ToR said brief - do you want resumes? What level of professional respect do we need to get here?

3. No. How can we when we have no idea what year we will be drilling?
I am a P.Eng., the directors of the company are P.Geol. I indicated in the text that we would use local experienced contractors, unless the MVEIRB has a list of people not to use or wants to be involved in the decision or has regulations that exclude companies from bidding on the project or operating in the NWT How more can I answer this.

Unless I am wrong any company licenced to provide services in the NWT is available to be contracted to provide us with services. Is there categories of companies or a "list" that

we have to use? Is the MVEIRB going to be involved in the selection of contractors or will it be left up to the companies P.Eng.'s and P.Geol.?

What do you want me to say here?

Section B-4 (page 4)

1. First you ask for specific details and then you ask for "Specifically ... any incidents of non-compliance."

I said "The consultant has been involved in numerous exploration projects throughout Canada and the United States that involved environmental bonding and which have never resulted in any forfeiture or other regulatory action with respect to environmental performance."

Does that not say "no incidence of non-compliance?"

What do you want me to say? What detail do you want? I mean I can describe each project and the environmental detail we did the precautions etc - but I thought we wanted to keep this under 50 pages!

I think we are getting close to "guilty till proven innocent" mentality, that is antithemic to our Canadian Jurisprudence. You cannot arrest a person because of what they have done in the past, for what they might do in the future. By asking for details of past performance the implication is that it will impact on the "decision" of future performance. That might be illegal! Just a comment!

Tell me what you want here.

Section C-1 (page 4)

1.&2. How specific do you want me to be? How specific can I be?

"winter period to further minimize potential environmental effects and is expected to be of 3-4 weeks"

Later I identified February to April 2004 (H-1 page 12). I don't know when the Land use permit will be issued, I don't know when the drill and equipment will be available. I don't know what the conditions of the ice will be like? ideally I could give a start date but it would be high speculative.

I could give plenty of what ifs but is that relevant.

Suffice to say the road would be built prior to the drill program starting - ideally a few days - and the drilling would finish - ideally 14 to 21 days later during the winter of 2003/04, or the next winter if we can't finance this year. Specifics are tied to the MVEIRB timeline and process which as we see are moveable.

Section C-2 (page 5)

1. The land use permit also referred to March 2003 et al. which has been changed to meet the referral.

Some consideration to fact that this DAR is in lieu of the Land Application and is modifying it should be made. This is obviously one.

What do you want me to say?

Section C-3 (page 7)

1. done.

Section G-1 (page 10)

1. I am not clear why this question is being asked. How can further consult with other parties? You have seen the correspondence from the First Nations, I don't know how we could further talk to them. I am in constant touch with the other Junior exploration

companies and know how their inquiries and contacts are progressing so have devoted CGW efforts to getting the DAR out and maybe we will have something to discuss.

The short answer is as outlined. How much more can we do?

Maps

1. Added.

2. The Star as stated on the Map is the "Drill Location Area." In the text the coordinates are outlined which are a little more precise, however until we are on site and the conditions at the time of drilling are ascertained there is a certain amount of uncertainty. If I were to draw the star to the dimension of the actual drill site you would not be able to see it. Some map reading experience has to be assumed. Some recognition that the map supports the text and visa versa has to be inherent.

How do you want me to modify this to reflect what detail you want.

3. Done

Miscellaneous

Obviously the footer came in when the Appendix Letter DFO was added. I will try to rectify. I think it is unprofessional to suggest that we would be trying to misuse it otherwise.

Laurie Stephenson