



Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

IR Response

Round One: Information Request - Yellowknives Dene First Nation #27

June 17, 2011

INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSE

EA No: 0809-001

Information Request No: YKDFN #27

Date Received

February 28, 2011

Linkage to Other IRs

YKDFN IR #24, 25
Alternatives North IR #01(e-f), 03
Review Board IR #27.
NSMA IR #02

Date of this Response

June 17, 2011

Request

Preamble:

During the EA preliminary period, the proponent(s) conducted a drilling program at the GIANT minesite. During this period, there was considerable uncertainty on the administration, inspection and regulation of this activity. Clarity on this point is important for the long term oversight of this project where the same department/governments occupy so many roles. The interaction between these proponents and regulatory inspection needs to be transparent for the Parties to have faith that the process is being conducted in such a way that it ensures their interests are being considered, not just the proponents. All parties at the scoping noted the need for independent oversight and monitoring review for this project – there is considerable unease with INAC and GNWT being the proponent, regulator and responsible authority. The perception surrounding the mixed mandate, seen lately in the LUP issues for the test drilling, is an issue that could manifest itself quite rapidly as all staff operate within the same reporting structure.

The document acknowledges that the overall responsibility for environmental management in relationship to GIANT mine is a shared responsibility between INAC and GNWT, with local Parties, at best, providing recommendations to the regulatory system. In recent regulatory permit processes, the YKDFN have seen the various regulatory bodies shuffle their concerns between them – each stating that it fell to other Boards and/or Departments, with no one actually stepping forward to ensure that the concerns of the First Nation had been addressed. There is little faith that the Crown can be trusted and the YKDFN refuse to accept a bit part in the guidance of this critical project which has thoroughly contaminated [in] one of the most productive areas in their traditional territory.





Giant Mine Environmental Assessment

IR Response

Round One: Information Request - Yellowknives Dene First Nation #27

June 17, 2011

Question:

1. It is requested that INAC explain why they did not choose to pursue an MVLWB permit. If the answer is that this site is administered by the GNWT, we request that GNWT provide answers as to how this site was regulated, inspected, and administered, including why MVLWB permits were not required.
2. It is the opinion of the YKDFN that independent oversight is the only way for the community and First Nation to have confidence that the remediation is transparent and the concerns of the local people are being addressed rather than that of the current government. INAC should be required to complete their design of the aboriginal and government body as well as providing information on how this body provides real and tangible oversight of the project. They should be required to outline a comprehensive rationale as to why co-management is inappropriate in this case.

Response 1

For a response to Question 1 the reader is respectfully referred to the Response to Information Request YKDFN #24.

Response 2

For a response to Question 2 the reader is respectfully referred to the Response to Information Request YKDFN #25.

