

Alan Ehrlich

From: Laurie Stephenson [stephmat@axion.net]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2003 9:42 AM
To: Sherry Sian
Cc: Alan Ehrlich
Subject: Consolidated Goldwin Venture's Land Use Application MV2003C0003



MILESTONE
updated.doc

Alan/Sherry

Subsequent to our telephone conversation yesterday (Wednesday), my review of the "Rules of Procedure..." and the written submissions which I have received, I am submitting the following observations:

1. The number of days by my reckoning are attached (in red on your initial Table of the "final" ToR). The importance of the decision date - now after the end of November is the ability of Consolidated GoldWin and New Shoshoni to gain regulatory approval for preparing an "Offering Memorandum" and securing the commitment of Funds to carry out the exploration programs. December is not a fortuitous month in that regard and neither is January, thus my concern expressed throughout this process of shortening the timing not lengthening it.

Rule 10 of your "Rules of Procedure ..." gives the board that option. Rule 30 emphasizes the "flexibility and informality" that are consistent with my request. Rules 44, 45 and 46 suggests that the time extension given in August was an issue that arose out of "the course of a proceeding" and therefore should have been identified as such and we given the opportunity to "respond to a Request" as per Rule 46.

However

2. I feel we were not adequately consulted with respects to the timing and scheduling of the Public Meeting and the pre-hearing conference, which given our major role as the lead "developer" was a major oversight, especially given the fact we are based outside the NWT.

3. With respects to the Yellowknife Dene submission. Does it need a written response? The reason I ask is there are some very "provocative" innuendo in their requests for information which in response will create more division than "effective dialogue." If the Board would address what additional information it needs to effectively further this process may be we can move from this confrontational approach.

4. With respects to the NWT RWED letter and the archeological study "delay request" we would have to object strenuously to any consideration of that request. Rules 33 and 34 of the "Rule of Procedure..." require "evidence" to be disclosed. An "understand[ing] that there are numerous ...sites" does not constitute evidence.

5. We have had a contact list of interested parties. Can we get the final list of Interveners with their full written reasons as per Rule 7? What is the final date for notice filing for participation and can you provide us with the subsequent list of participants.

6. The submissions as of September 2 are : The NWT RWED letter; the DFO Letter (which I will be addressing seperately); the INAC letter and the YKDFN report. IS that all? I assume the DAR's are automatic.

7. What is the status of the MVEIRB Cumulative Effects Report? It was supposedly ready the 20th of August.

8. The pre-hearing conference: can we conduct it by telephone or do we need to be there? The cost to date for the junior companies including the June conference, the April meeting, the DAR including consultations with EBA engineering is in the order of \$10,000 (per company) with the inclusion of the pre-hearing conference another \$5,000 can be anticipated. At 10% of the overall exploration budget for the preliminary drilling project, the likes of which have been ..., I would like to reduce if possible any extraneous expenditures.

9. Since as provide in one of my previous emails my personal time is being impinged by this process, I have to know as soon as possible what changes I have to make.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

Laurence Stephenson
Consultant
Consolidated GoldWin Ventures Ltd.