

De Beers EA meeting at MVLWB Boardroom

9:15 am. July 27/01

Louie Azzolini

Kevin O'Reilly

Zoe Posynick

Paula Pacholek

In person Mark Dahl

Mary Tapsell

Buddy Williams

Rick Schryer

Robin Johnstone

Joe Acorn

on phone Steve Ellis

Tim Byers

LA: Introductions

- send out emails to everyone - schedule, WP, etc
- has 5 items to discuss
 - RoP
 - timelines
 - 5.128(1)
 - corp. history and env. record
 - notes of meeting

MT: just got the emails this morning because of delays due to the virus. Not ready to talk about the schedule in detail.

LA: home until the 3rd to get comments in on the WP. Board meets on Aug 1 so need to get Board requests in by today

MT: clarifying that even if someone comments here in the meeting, they still need to put it in writing

LA: yes.

MT: concerned about the formality. People might think that talking to R.B. staff is sufficient and wouldn't have to submit comments in writing.

LA: appreciate the concern and the R.B. staff will read appropriately in an issue

BW: Will there be a 2nd draft?

LA: Yes. We take info. to them and they decide what they want to include in the WP.

BW: What is the Board thinking?

LA: Don't know. We do not sit in on our entire meeting.

BW: wondering about specific items such as whether they intend to have hearings.

LA: The R.B. owns the W.P. Staff does the 1st draft but the Board takes over after that. Any items to add to the agenda

~~- will be making a written submission today~~
KO: - extension for comment timelines
- ruling on intervenor funding
- ruling on formal public hearings

- if others have these or other issues, they need to write to the R.B.

LA: KO's procedure is incorrect. The R.B. makes decisions

MT: need to state why you are asking a ruling and what direction you want the ruling to take.

LA: Agenda Item #1. Draft RoP.
90-120 days will be formal rules
of the Board

MT - looking for comments

LA - yes, will be advertised soon.
- Roland taking care of it.

PP - discuss the RoP in detail?

LA - no, tell the Board if you have
any objections to any item.

PP - do not want them as they stand
now

LA - write to the Board. Implemented
because we need some structure
to EAs

MT - are past comments and responses
available?

LA - doesn't think so

KU - go with an access to info request
- has concerns because the RoP
set up 4 classes of participants.

- other bodies (MWT Water Board + mtwof)
- have just a couple of classes
- these ROP setup several classes that are unequal and would not support their use.

~~LA - for many people to comment on them~~

LA - described the classes

RB

KO - the ROP should have provided notice earlier. This EA has already begun and some items are already irrelevant

LA - Doesn't care if they are used but the RB needs them. Will be discussed. Trying to get responses from other. Past problems with EA structure.

MT - problem difference between staff and R.B. members. What is a proceeding? Does reference to Board include staff? Is this a procedure?

LA - the entire EA is a procedure. We can speak for procedure not man

MT - how is info presented to the Board?

- Does staff not do analysis?

LA - no. We do synthesize for them.
Up to reviewers to make their case.

MT - will they present their significance
criteria?

LA - they don't have to

BW - what is the deadline for submission of
comments

LA -

- expressing frustration with repeatedly
having to defend the R.B.'s independence

- did not write these RoP. Looking
for comments on what NSOs, govt,
and FN

RT - so comments on procedure will
be taken to the R.B.

LA -

RT - so written are not required if
we do not ~~not~~ need to use them

LA - will be in the Notes to File so

written submission not required

MD - some should put our concerns in writing

RT - De Bevo is prepared to accept the draft ROP. Some improvement is possible but some rules are better than no rules. Will be making a written submission

LA - can we skip over to Jim's concerns

O.K.

~~Jim~~

TB - questions about a certain part of the Act. 5.128(1) states that.....

- in BHP, no significance was found.

What about significant public concern?

How is it defined and measured? How much public concern is necessary?

Local or national public concern?

Can public concern enough to override

no sig. env. impacts

- would like a Board ruling to

clarify this

KO - CEAA has produced a guideline
on significant public concern.
Discretionary. ~~For~~ The R.B. can
establish criteria or go case-by-
case.

- cited an example

- Up to the R.B. Does know if they have
developed criteria in the new guidelines

TB - will the R.B. use the CEAA document

LA - they can build it had to. They
base their decision or initiation in
the public registry.

KO - will email the list to Jim.
- can ask the R.B. for a reply.

LA - been a point of contention about
criteria used by R.B. to make
decisions.
Next point Jim?

TB - copy his and env. record. INAC put
together a request to Jatera for
the Jatera project. Cited some

examples. See this as a
positive example. To MT - how
did the proposal report.

MT - ^{not} was able to find out anything this
week but will continue to look
into it.

TB - what would De Beere think of
including this info (such as previous
relationships with First Nations people).

RT - will have a look at the conformity
review for Jernbo and use it as a
guide for them

TB - this info is helpful. Relationships
outside of North America.

KO - best disclosure was requested
in the BHP panel guidelines. Included
fine, court proceedings, problems, etc.
We ask for the same for Diarr but
INAC didn't agree. Link ~~of~~ on
the CARC web-site.

TB - can this section in the TOR be
filled out more to ask for
specific items?

KO - item of concern for her as well.
Should go back to BHP.

LA - you can request anything. Make
it a formal request to the R.B.

TB - they will be submitting something.
Several issues

LA - meeting notes will not be sufficient
for making a request

KO - ~~an~~ important issue for CARC was
problems with compliance with current
class B under license

MT - notes that env. rec. is not in the
ToR.

KO - we will discuss Part 5 here.

LA - Jim, anything else.

TB - information exchange after public
regulatory closure.

LA - have a look at the R.F. and let the
R.B. know what you think

4:00
+ D

RT - we will do the best we can
to ensure everything is submitted
on a timely basis. However, some IRs
will likely be answered at the last
minute.

TB - last minute O.R. as long as the
answer is clear.

RT - understood. Clear questions would
help

KO - Jim, look at ROP #7 + 31.

TB - O.K.

LA - Steve, any issues

SE - echo Jim's comments

LA - been in contact with NIRB. Mr. Tillman?
lawyer for NIRB. ~~Each~~ Each Board is
aware of what the other does.

KO - MPEIRB was invited to participate in funds
~~by~~ the but did not. Why?

LA - the Board will not take action without
evidence justifying the action

- discussions on-going with NTRB
about coordinating activities



LA - 10:20 - break for 10 minutes

LA - 10:40 - back to the schedule for an hour

- last week was requested to
provide more detail to the schedule
indicating no. of days required.
- go through activities / milestones

MT - cannot comment because have not
looked at it

LA - don't comment here then. Put your
comments in writing

- going through the lines in the
schedule

KO - calendar or business days. Indicate that
on the schedule

LA - calendar days

~~BTB~~

LA - R.B. reviewed the referral on May 23rd

- continues through list of schedule items

KO - don't need the second ~~item~~ item

- what is the difference between the 2nd and 3rd items?

LA - provided an explanation

MT - 60 days is not correct. More like 40 days. June 21 - Aug. 3

KO - more interested in key decision points?

When will the Board be making decisions?

LA - we can proceed on that basis

RJ - also these items are not ^{just} consecutive
many are concurrent

LA - yes need to see the entire table

- cannot print them off in our office

RJ - De Beers can provide copies to anyone
who cannot print it off

MT - what about the communities?

SE - we got the schedule (Excel file) but haven't
looked at it

~~LA~~

MT - will have to provide written comments

LA - yes, public registry will be open to
Aug. 17th? but would like the Aug. 3 date
respected

RJ - Aug. 3 should be on the schedule
- explicit and understandable

KO - doesn't care what the Board is doing.
- want to see important dates

PP - need various schedules depending on
the target

MT - simple and detailed schedules

KO - want ^{to} the screen to point out what
he wants to see

LA - that will be done

KO - more interested in line frames rather
than specific dates
- needs to know how much line is available
- specific dates should be footnoted
as changeable

LA - ~~was~~ that will be done

- continues with schedule items

MT - ~~looking~~ suggested modifying schedule
by moving blocks closer to items end

RT - disagrees. Need the whole schedule laid
out.

LA - Tom, any comments

TB - believes deadlines dates should
be firmly placed in the schedule

SE - haven't looked at it yet. Comments later

KO - looking at various items in the schedule
- many do not need to be shown
- wants the basic steps listed

RT - have begin date and due date in the
first couple columns

MT - are there 21 days of hearings?

LA - somewhere in there. Could be a couple
of days or weeks. The block of time
is set aside

MT - will it have to be presented to the public?

RJ - no timetable for this but can still be on-going throughout the process

BW - does the R.B.'s decision on conformity potentially delay the EA process

MT - what if one item ~~is not~~ is not answered, need to page

LA - specific items may result in ~~delays~~ delaying portions of the process if the R.B. received a request and agrees.

PP - how often do they get together?

LA - twice a month but more if needed

BW - open to receiving info throughout the process

LA - yes, can ask for info at anytime if it is needed.

KO - when does the Board make a ruling on the adequacy of the report?

LA - no formal discussion of adequacy

KO - conformity just a presence/absence check, and IRs deal with technical adequacy.

- Does the Board at some point make a ruling on the adequacy of the EA Report.

LA - No

BW - will there be something indicating who will be providing analysis in that area?

LA - yes, to some

BW - but how will expertise be defined?

LA - will expect you to be an expert

- up to you as you'll to make your conclusions and defend it

KO - explaining his understanding of the process.

- IR process is done before the technical reports are done

R.B. could decide it does not have
the info it needs to make a decision
whether to go to public hearings

LA - Yes

SE - only govt experts to be solicited?

LA - no, everyone

SE - how do we know they are qualified?

LA - they have to prove it

SE - so how do we know they are experts?

LA - ~~they~~ the Board will judge the evidence
presented.

SE - concerned about matching elders vs.
scientific experts

KO - file an info request to request the
qualifications of the experts
Expert opinion depends on experience/
credentials.

LA - R.B. is balanced - just relies on govt.
- has the ability to make a call and

evaluate info received from all sources

KO - would public hearings be limited to certain issues? What if people want to talk about other things?

LA - ~~if~~ The hearing will be focused on certain items but other items may come up.

~~LA~~

MT - how can we complete the technical analysis when we do not have the IR answers. Need line between IR answers and technical report.

LA - yes, request additional line if needed with ~~justified~~ justification.

KO - so parties can decide they need more IRs?

LA - yes. How reports ~~can~~ must ensure that they have if the info provided.

BW - seems to be the R.B.'s responsibility to ensure everything is covered off.

LA - The Board will attempt to fill gaps

RJ - back up to LA's response to Steve.
so the RB would differ

JA - why the differentiation between providing
experts ~~info~~ qualification in written vs oral

MT - not sure

LA - The R.B. can get the experts resumes
if they want it

RJ - probably not personal resume info,
but

TB - when would the public registry close?

LA - not a specific date yet

TB - should get that in the schedule

RJ - under road in 2003 very important to
the DeBeers. Existing schedule ~~not~~
O.K. but further ~~to~~ extension not
acceptable.

LA - hydro is a timely RA

KO - R.B. must be legal requirements and
allow time for people to be involved.

RT - not cutting corners. Thorough
EA is expected.

~~BT~~

MT - no slippage is allowed in this schedule

BW - others may have other items to include

JA - this is a fair schedule. Not going to start
off with a word - case schedule.

KO - should not be putting dates in the
schedule. Will cause problems
when unexpected things occur

LA - ~~except~~ expecting that BHP and
Dionik would have taught everyone to
be more efficient.

- we will adjust the schedule as
required, forward or back, based on
the evidence.

~~BT - reviewing public hearings~~

BW - comments on scheduling public
hearings.

To RT - is the Aug. 15 date final or
later in the fall?

RJ - no drop dead date at this time.

- believes this is a fair schedule

but recognizes changes can occur.

KO - Aug. 15 is the date of the R.F. decision

- allow 30 days ~~to~~ for the Federal Minister

- time for MV/WB - hearing in December

order release in January, negotiate
environmental agreements, IBA's.

- doesn't see how De Beers can meet

the ^{road} under 2003 given the other
requirements.

RJ - aware of the other requirements

- will work to Aug. 15

TB - wants timelines to be as flexible as
possible. First Nations and proponents
are often at odds on timelines

MD - Env. Canada will submit written
comments on the schedule.

LA - Env. Canada has been the most
technically robust gov't department.

KO - concludes that the Aug. 15 date is
optimistic.

PP - will be submitting their own notes
on this meeting

LA - the rest of you can meet this
afternoon on the T&R.
- Joe and I will be leaving now

- meeting broke up at 12:15 pm.

MEETING NOTES

Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board

Subject: De Beers Work Plan Session
Date: July 27, 2001 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Prepared by: Joe Acorn and Louie Azzolini
Location: 7th floor of the YK Centre Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board, Board room

Attendees

Rick Schryer, Golder
Robin Johnstone, De Beers
Joe Acorn, MVEIRB
Louie Azzolini, MVEIRB and chair
Steve Ellis, Lutsel K'e First Nation
Kevin O'Reilly, CARC
Paula Pacholek, EC
Mark Dahl, EC
Buddy Williams, DIAND
Mary Tapsell, DIAND
Zoe Posynick, GNWT
Darren Campbell, MVLWB

Teleconference:

Tim Byers, Yellowknives Dene First Nation
Steve Ellis, Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation

Agenda

Working session began at 9:10 AM.

The meeting began with a round of introductions and a summary of agenda items including: work plan timelines, s.128(1) and ambiguity associated with that section, De Beers corporate history and environmental record, Rules of Procedure and notes taken from the meeting July 20, 2001.

Key Issue	Summary of discussion
1. Issue of computer software compatibility and access to digital information	Ms. Tapsell indicated that due to virus risks the Indian and Northern Affairs (INAC) network was closed to outside email traffic and subsequently she could not access digital information provided for the session. Ms. Tapsell also noted the importance of preparing digital information that was compatible across software platforms in government.

<p>2. Familiarity with material distributed</p>	<p>Ms. Tapsell indicated that she was unfamiliar with the material being presented and that INAC's comments would likely be represented in written communications.</p> <p>Ms. Tapsell also wanted to know that even if someone provided comments in the meeting that they would still have to provide written comments for the registry. To which Mr. Azzolini indicated that was in fact the case. Mr. Williams asked if a second draft of the Terms of Reference (ToR) and the Work Plan (WP) would be prepared. Mr. Azzolini indicated that was the case, but that he had not insight into how the Review Board (RB) would take and synthesize the information into its final ToR and WP.</p>
<p>3. Public Hearings.</p>	<p>Mr. Williams asked if the RB in its considerations would perhaps have a public meeting or hearing. Mr. Azzolini indicated that the WP and the ToR belong to the RB and that they would decide based if they wanted any hearings. To which Mr. O'Reilly indicated he would make a written submission requesting an extension of the comment period, a ruling on intervenor funding, and a ruling on formal public hearings for the purposes of scoping the ToR. He also said that if others has ruling to request of the RB that they write to the RB. Mr. Azzolini agreed with Mr. O'Reilly that his procedures were correct. Ms. Tapsell added that a request for ruling should be specific about what direction one is seeking in a ruling from the RB.</p>

4. Rules of Procedure (RoP)

Mr. Azzolini noted the Review Board would formalize the RoP in 90-120 days. Then, they would be the official RoP for the Board. There questions regarding what the Review Board was looking for at this time and if there was going to be a formalized consultation period. Mr. Azzolini said there was going to be a consultation period and that he primarily wanted to know if people objected to using them. He also asked the experts and Responsible Ministers (RM's) let the Review Board know what they thought about using the rules of procedure now given they would likely become official in October 2001. Ms. Tapsell asked if for the chronology of changes based on previous input. Mr. Azzolini said he did not think they were available. Mr. O'Reilly said an Access To Information Request would fix that quickly. He also said he was concerned because the RoP essentially created four classes of participants, while other bodies such as the NWT Water Board or the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB) only had a couple of classes and that because there were several unequal classes created he could not support them. Mr. O'Reilly said the RB should have provided notice earlier and that given the De Beers EA had started some items in the RoP were irrelevant. Ms. Tapsell added she had problems distinguishing between staff and RB members, what in fact was a proceeding and if reference to the RB included staff and what constituted a procedure. Ms Tapsell then asked how information is presented to the RB and if staff undertakes any analysis. Mr. Azzolini that RB staff primarily synthesized information and that it was up to experts to make their case to the RB. Ms. Tapsell then asked if the RB would present its significance criteria to which Mr. Azzolini said they were not obliged to. Mr. Williams then enquired when the deadline for submission of comments was.

Mr. Dahl indicated that all comments should be put in writing and Mr. Johnstone said the De Beers was prepared to accept the draft RoP. He agreed there was some improvements possible but that some rules were better than no rules and that the company would make that submission in writing.

<p>5. s.128.(1) and the application of public concern</p>	<p>Mr. Byers noted that in the BHP EA there was no public concern identified and that was odd given there was some and that if the YDFN did not express a significant public concern he wanted to know what constituted a significant public concern. He also asked if the Review Board would provide a ruling on the matter to clear up any confusion. Mr. O'Reilly noted the CEAA produced a guideline on significant public concern. He appreciated the discretionary nature of the RB decision-making process and that he also appreciated how the RB could develop or establish criteria on a case-by-case basis for significance. Mr. Byers enquired if the RB would use CEAA significance criteria to which Mr. Azzolini said they could but that they did not have to because ultimately they would make their decision on what was in the public registry. Mr. O'Reilly said he would email the web link and ask the RB for a ruling. Mr. Azzolini noted the significance issue was a point of contention for some time. Mr. Byers then pointed out that INCA put together a reasonable request for the Tahara mine developed and was wondering how the proponent responded in that case. Ms. Tapsell said she would look into it before responding.</p> <p>Mr. Byers asked what De Beers thought of including more information on corporate history and environmental performance including such things as previous relationships with First Nations peoples. Mr. Johnstone said he would look at the Tahera conformity review and use it as a guide for their work. Mr. Byers said that information would be helpful, especially relationships outside of North America. Mr. O'Reilly noted that the best example of corporate disclosure was in the BHP panel guidelines. The request and the results were detailed and thorough. CARC asked for similar information in the DIAVIK CSR but INAC would not agree to it. Mr. Byers requested that the ToR on corporate information be filled out with the specific items discussed, to which Mr. O'Reilly agreed. Mr. O'Reilly added that a reason they requested the development go to EA was the issue of class B water licence compliance.</p>
<p>6. Information exchange after closing the public registry.</p>	<p>Mr. Byers asked based on the problems he experienced during the BHP EA if some allowances were being made to accommodate additional information requirements and submissions after the close of the public registry. Mr. Johnstone said he would do his best to make sure information was placed on the public registry in a timely basis but that it was probably inevitable that some Information Requests (IR'S) would come in just in time. He added that clear questions in IR's would help speed his ability to respond to them. Mr. O'Reilly then asked the group to the draft RoP that addressed the RB's access to information after closing the public registry.</p>
<p>7. Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB)</p>	<p>Mr. Azzolini said the RB was in contact with NIRB and that the respective Boards were aware of each other's work, and that our respective legal counsels had spoken to each other. Mr. O'Reilly asked why although asked to participate in the Tahera project the RB did not. Mr. Azzolini said that the RB would not take action without having justification for the action, and that as a footnote; the RB was active with NEB about coordinating their respective activities.</p>

8. Work Plan schedule and various procedural matters

Mr. Azzolini asked the group to discuss work planning and the amended schedule the group had requested. Ms. Tapsell expressed concern that she had not reviewed the material before the meeting. Mr. Azzolini indicated that she was free to provide any comments in writing after the meeting. Mr. O'Reilly asked if the RB used calendar or business days. Mr. Azzolini said they were calendar days. Mr. O'Reilly suggested that the work plan not show internal RB activity items but items that were of importance to people participating in the EA. Ms. Tapsell asked about communities and their capacity and ability to review the documents. She also asked if written comments on the timelines were needed, and Mr. Azzolini said yes. Mr. Johnstone indicated that clear milestone days needed to be put into the workplan, to which Mr O'Reilly added that he cared more about the key dates that would impact his schedules. Ms. Tapsell added that staff could maintain the detailed schedule and everyone else could get a generalized schedule.

Mr. O'Reilly said he was more interested in period's then specific dates because he wants to know the time available and that specific dates should be footnoted as dependent and changeable. Ms. Tapsell added that the table should be made easier to read and see. Mr. Tim Byers added he wanted to see deadline dates firmly placed on the schedule. Mr. O'Reilly added that many items on the schedule as shown were unnecessary for their work and that the basic key steps were the most important for him. There was a suggestion to have begin and due dates on the column next to the specific section of the EA. Ms. Tapsell enquired if there were 21 days allocated for hearings to which Mr. Azzolini said yes, but it was not necessary to have a full 21 days of meetings. Ms. Tapsell also asked if De Beers would be presenting its report to the public to which Mr. Johnstone said De Beers would but that a formal consultation plan was not tied to the release of the EA report.

Mr. Williams asked if the RB's conformity decision could delay the EA, and Ms. Tapsell added what if any of the proceeding activities in an EA are not completed to the RB's satisfaction would there be slippage. Mr. Azzolini said delays were always possible and that the RB would decide based on requests for rulings. Mr. Azzolini was asked how often the RB convened and he said twice a month but more if necessary and that the RB was open to receiving information throughout the EA process and that the RB could ask for additional information at any time if it was needed.

Mr. O'Reilly asked if the RB made rulings on the adequacy of the De Beers EAR and Mr. Azzolini said the RB made no formal decision on the adequacy of the report, but will not take a decision without being satisfied it has adequate quality information. Mr. O'Reilly asked if conformity was the simple check for the presence/absence of information requested in the ToR and if the Review Board would make a ruling on the adequacy of its Environmental Assessment Report. Mr. Azzolini replied no to both questions.

Mr. Williams asked if the RB would provide an indication of the respective areas of the ToR that various government experts would provide analysis. **Mr. Azzolini said yes, that he would prepare a table summarizing on a line by line basis what government experts HE THOUGHT would be covering various areas and that it would be up to the government experts to accept or reject his assignment of responsibility for expert review.**

Mr. Williams then asked how expertise was defined and if the RB would define it. Mr. Azzolini said he would expect any government contributor to be an expert and that as an expert you would be expected to arrive at your own conclusions and defend them with supporting evidence. Mr. O'Reilly then explained his understanding of the process. Mr. Steve Ellis then asked if only government experts were used and how the RB knew they were qualified and how elders' knowledge was matched to technical scientific knowledge. Mr. Azzolini replied that not only government experts were used, that traditional knowledge was a valid form or expert knowledge from acknowledged contributors. Mr. O'Reilly then said that the LDFN could file an IR to see the qualifications of the government expert to see if they thought the credentials were adequate.

Mr. O'Reilly asked if public hearings were planned on certain items or issues and what about the ability of people at public meetings to discuss other matters. Ms. Tapsell asked how government experts could possibly complete their technical reviews when for example they had not received completed IR's from De Beers. Mr. Azzolini said to request additional information as needed with supporting justification and remember that anyone can ask for information so check the public registry because somebody might have asked the question and received the answer already.

Mr. Williams said it appears that it's the RB's job to make sure everything is covered off and that there are no gaps outstanding. Mr. Azzolini said yes and that if necessary the RB had various statutory authorities under the MVRMA to secure information it deemed necessary.

Mr. Byers asked when the public registry would close. Mr. Azzolini said that the specific date was not set yet. Mr. Byes said that the date the public registry closes should be put into the work plan. Mr. O'Reilly provided his synopsis of the EA timelines as they pertained to De Beers and its desire for a winter 2003 deadline for transporting goods up the winter road. To which Ms. Tapsell added there did not appear to be any slippage allowances in the work plan. There were questions about when public hearing might happen, if enough time was being allocated to the EA, if the work plan schedule was fair, if there was sufficient flexibility in the work plan and schedule and if there was room for allowances for unexpected events.

Mr. Azzolini noted EC's consistent technical contributions and encouraged other experts to follow EC's example.

Adjourned 12:00 PM

Louie Azzolini

From: Louie Azzolini
Sent: Tuesday, August 07, 2001 9:49 AM
To: Brett Hudson (E-mail); Bridgette Larocque; Buddy Williams (E-mail); CARC Kevin (E-mail); Chamber of mines ED (E-mail); CPAWS (E-mail); Dechi Laot'i First Nation (E-mail); Doug Soloway (E-mail); EAO2; Ecology North (E-mail); Health Canada 2 (E-mail); John Donihee (E-mail); John Ramsey (E-mail); Julie Dahl (E-mail); Lana Paulson (E-mail); LKDFN Wildlife Lands Environment Ctte (E-mail); Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation (E-mail); Mark Dahl (E-mail); Mark Lange DFO (E-mail); Mary Tampsell (E-mail); MVLWB Permit (E-mail) (E-mail); NSMA Bob Turner (E-mail); Nunavut Impact Review Board (E-mail); Paula Pacholek [Yel] (E-mail); Robin Johnstone (E-mail); Roland Semjanovs; Roland Semjanovs (E-mail); Sierra Legal Defence Fund (E-mail 2); Stephen Harbicht (E-mail); Tamara Hamilton (E-mail); Tim Byers (E-mail); Vern Christensen; Wha Ti First Nation (E-mail); William (Bill) Carpenter (E-mail); WWF - Peter J. Ewins (E-mail); WWF Tony Y. (E-mail); YK Chamber of Commerce (E-mail)
Subject: DRAFT Meeting Notes from the De Beers July 27 Working Session



July 27
ordinators meeting.c

Please review the attached meeting notes and let me know what errors of omission, commission or presupposition you find for remediation and inclusion in the final copy.

Sincerely,

Luciano Azzolini,
Environmental Assessment Officer,
Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board,
Box 938, Yellowknife, NT. X1A 2N7
Phone (867) 873-9189; Fax 920-4761;
mveirb.nt.ca