

From: kevin o'reilly [mailto:kor@theedge.ca]

Sent: July-27-12 9:51 AM

To: Alan Ehrlich

Cc: Morag.McPherson@dfo-mpo.gc.ca; Adrian.Paradis@inac-ainc.gc.ca; Ray_Case@gov.nt.ca; tslack@ykdene.com; bob_bromley@gov.nt.ca; dkefalas@yellowknife.ca; rfreeman@ykdene.com; gordon.hamre@gmail.com; gvantighem@yellowknife.ca; ehoeve@eba.ca; joankuyek@sympatico.ca; Joanna.Ankersmit@aadnc-aandc.gc.ca; avens@ssimicro.com; amy.sparks@gc.ec.ca

Subject: re: Follow-up from Pre-Hearing Conference for Giant Mine EA

Importance: High

Alan

Thank you to the Review Board for hosting the pre-hearing conference yesterday for the Giant Mine EA. The purpose of this e-mail is to confirm a number of commitments made by Alternatives North and other parties. Please post this e-mail to the public registry.

Information Required Prior to Hearing (preferably by August 10 and not all at once)

1. Freeze Optimization Study trade-off study (lessons learned) and description of the development of performance criteria
2. Arsenic chamber wetting study progress report
3. Best Available Technology (BAT) findings for water treatment evaluation
4. AANDC organizational charts for the Giant Mine Remediation Plan (including location of position), for both project implementation and the perpetual care phase
5. Risk Assessment for Ingraham trail users study based on exposure to redicted air quality standard exceedances
6. Updated project cost estimates with Baker Creek costs split out
7. AANDC Northern Contaminated Site Program report on document preservation and information management
8. Tailings cover objectives and design update
9. Site Stabilization Plan as approved by the AANDC Minister in November 2011

We understand that AANDC/GNWT as the Developer will provide an updated list of commitments made to date and a table that lists and shows its responses to each recommendation (measures and suggestions) made by the parties that have submitted Technical Reports on time. This is to be filed with the Review Board on or before August 10, 2012.

To confirm the amount of time that Alternatives North requests for presentations, we provide the following list:

1. Opening Statement (5-10 minutes)
 2. Surface (15 minutes)
 3. Freezing/Underground (15 minutes)
 4. Water (15 minutes)
 5. Risk, Monitoring, Management and Perpetual Care
- General Presentation (15-30 minutes)
--Joan Kuyek (Perpetual Care Case Studies and Lessons Learned) (30 minutes)
--Karen Hamre (Giant Mine Designations) (20 minutes)

--Amy Taylor or Duncan Kenyan [presenter to be confirmed] (Perpetual Care Funding Options) (30 minutes)

6. Closing Statement (15 minutes or as determined by the Review Board)

On or before August 22, Alternatives North will file our presentations for the public hearing along with resumes for any experts we expect will participate at the hearing. We would like the same information from the other parties.

Please be advised that Alternatives North intends to question AANDC/GNWT as the Developer on the following topics. The time we require is somewhat dependent on the additional information requested above by August 10 and the possible responses to the measures and suggestions made in our Technical Report. Estimates are provided below for planning purposes:

1. Surface (30 minutes)
2. Freezing/Underground (45 minutes)
3. Water (45 minutes)
4. Risk, Monitoring, Management and Perpetual Care (60 minutes)

Alternatives North would like to question the City of Yellowknife and Environment Canada (with regard to the policy context for perpetual care of site remediated under the Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan) and would like to make sure these parties are at the public hearing.

Although we did not discuss the unresolved issues in any detail yesterday, Alternatives North provides the following list:

- Ice thinning caused by the diffuser
- Effects of air emissions on Ingraham trail users
- Far-field modelling of water quality in Yellowknife Bay caused by the diffuser – aquatic effects
- Frozen block design and performance criteria (report to be filed in July)
- Perpetual Care planning and management, including long term funding
- Environmental management plans, components/objectives/criteria
- Independent Oversight
- Organizational chart for AANDC roles and responsibilities
- Response to Long-Term Funding IR from Review Board (June 18, 2012 letter from AN)
- Outstanding Items from Round Two IR Responses (March 8, 2012 letter from AN)
 - Limited progress on environmental management plans (AN#3-1)
 - Details on 10-year technology review (AN#4-1)
 - Commitment to pay for incremental water treatment costs caused by the development (AN#8)
 - Land use controls not identified or analyzed (AN#11-1)
 - Cost of remediating town site area to meet City's plans (AN#12-2)
 - City permits and licences required to carry out development (AN #15-2)

- Unclear how the Developers will involve the parties in future risk assessments (AN#18-1)
- AN Technical Report (not covered above)
 - Apology
 - Written guidance for AANDC employees to avoid conflicts
 - Research and development plan for underground arsenic
 - Environmental Agreement for the Giant Mine

Should you require any further information and clarification of the above, please contact me by phone or by e-mail. Thanks.

Kevin O'Reilly
Alternatives North