

## Sherry Sian

---

**From:** Sherry Sian  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2003 3:17 PM  
**To:** 'Laurie Stephenson'  
**Subject:** RE: Information Requirements for Consolidated Goldwin Ventures DAR

Laurie,

Thanks for your quick response. You have provided most of the answers to the questions raised. Please address the items remaining to avoid the need to pursue non-conformity.

You are welcome to submit an addendum or re-submit the report to correct the footer problem. The only reason for a re-submission would be to avoid confusion about the footer. Please let me know what your preference is.

In regard to your questions, please see the following... \*

a-1 (p.1)

1. From your response it is inferred that no clearing is required because the drill location is on the shore of a pond. Is any clearing required to get to the pond where you will be drilling? If yes, how much?

2. This question relates to the shoreline, specifically... is the access point:

- steep?
- rocky/sandy/vegetated, etc.?
- (i.e., potential for erosion/need for clearing, etc.)

a-1 (p. 2)

2. Some parties may not be familiar with procedures and the Report needs to provide sufficient explanation for their understanding. The description provided will be adequate for the Review Board's consideration.

Section B-1 (p. 3)

1 and 2. This is a standard request that speaks to a familiarity with the sensitivities and seasonal concerns of operating in northern environments. Please list a few relevant northern mineral exploration projects (perhaps in BC or the Yukon) that have been completed by Consolidated Goldwin Ventures and you as the consultant of Consolidated Goldwin Ventures.

For example, North American General Resources Corporation provided the following...

"The Company has only made preliminary exploration efforts in the north, that being towards the Wool Bay property. These include a brief geological site visit to the property in July 2002 by an outside consultant, Robert Brown, P.Geo. and a gravity survey conducted by Aurora Geosciences of Yellowknife, neither of which required a Land Use Permit nor caused any surface disturbance. However, Mr. Cowley, P.Geo., Director and Vice President Exploration has worked in the NWT and Nunavut since 1986 with BHP Minerals, Hope Bay Joint Venture and Cumberland Resources Ltd. Mr. Cowley operated as Project Geologist and later Program Manager for BHP from 1986 to 1995 from Yellowknife to the Coronation Gulf. Mr. Cowley was a geological consultant for Hope Bay Joint Venture in the Hope Bay Volcanic Belt east of Umingmaktuk from January 2000 to December 2001 and with Cumberland Resources Ltd. on their Meadowbank project north of Baker Lake from February to December 2002. He has acted respectfully, responsibly and professionally in his duties."

3. From your response, it is inferred that you have not secured any contractors to implement this development.

Section B-4 (p. 4)

1. From your response, no incidents of non-compliance exist.

Section C-1 (p. 4)

1. and 2. Your response is sufficient for the consideration of the Review Board.

Section C-2 (p. 5)

1. It is inferred from your response that helicopter support will no longer be used for this development.

Section C-3 (p.7)

1. Please provide the amended map.

Section G-1 (p. 10)

1. It is inferred from your response that you have spoken with no parties since being referred to environmental assessment.

Maps

Please provide an amended map that contains details about ice road access route to the drilling location.

As the archaeological and traditional land uses are related to this referral, locations must be clear. From your response and submission, it is inferred that the variability in locations will be minor (2-3 metres) therefore not observable at the scale noted. Please indicate precise drill locations as points.

Regards,  
Sherry

-----Original Message-----

From: Laurie Stephenson [mailto: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 co-ordinates 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