

Opening Speaking Notes

- Opening Prayer
- Welcome
- Introduce Board Members and staff
- Round of introductions for Parties and public

Purpose of Hearing

- Today and tomorrow we will be holding a public hearing on two projects; two mineral exploration projects proposed by two different companies, Consolidated Gold Win Ventures and Sidon International Resources Corp.
- **Initially, the Board had decided to hold hearings for each of these two projects on separate days, the Parties told the Review Board that it would be better to combine the hearings, if you have specific concerns that apply to only one company, or only to one proposed drilling site, be specific and clear in stating this.**
- These two companies propose to conduct diamond drilling in a number of areas in the general vicinity of the north shore of Great Slave Lake, including around Moose Bay,

Moose Lake, Defeat Lake, Jackfish Cove and Zig Zag Lake. We have posted some maps up of the area on the walls here that depict some of those areas.

- Details about the projects will be provided by representatives of the Developer during their presentation.
- When it makes its decision the Review Board will consider the information provided to it at this hearing. The Board will listen to what you have to say and may ask questions. Other parties will have opportunities to ask questions as well.
- After the end of this hearing the Board will have to decide whether it has enough information to make a recommendation based on section 128 of the MVRMA. There are a series of options open to the Review Board under that section including:
 - whether the projects should go ahead, with or without conditions; or
 - whether the projects should not go ahead;

- If there is not enough information on the record to make a decision the Board may choose to enter a second phase of this environmental assessment [to be discussed later]
- When the Board is of the opinion that a decision can be made, it will consider those issues that are within its mandate and will forward its recommendation to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Hearing Details

- Simultaneous translation is occurring. For that reason all speakers should speak slowly and clearly. There will be a transcript of the entire hearing provided soon afterwards.
- Time has been set aside in this Hearing for members of the general public to present their views about the proposed developments. If you wish to take advantage of this opportunity, please introduce yourself to our staff during one of the breaks.

- An agenda has been made available, extra copies are on the sign-in table.
- There have been some adjustments made to the agenda since it was distributed last week. Some parties have notified us that they will be traveling out on Wednesday afternoon, so we have decided to move their presentations forward. [Indicate the changes].
- Depending on how much time people will take to speak today, we may be able to move up some other presentations from the Parties as well.
- During the presentations, Parties are given the opportunity to ask questions after each presentation. I will ask each of parties if they have any questions for the presenters.
- If time permits, questions from the general public may be asked.
- Parties and members of the public are requested to keep their questions and statements brief and on the topic.

- The Review Board will inform the Parties following the hearing regarding closure of the public record. When the Review Board decides to close the record, it will give a notification of at least 2 weeks before closure to allow Parties to submit final written materials.
- I will now speak a bit about the history of this MVEIRB proceeding.

Start-Up and Workplan:

- The Review Board referred these two projects to environmental assessment on its own motion on September 8, 2005 under the authority set out in ss.126(3) of the MVRMA.
- The Board called the projects up on the basis of the public concern that was expressed about the two projects.
- This concern was primarily expressed by the Yellowknives Dene First Nation during the preliminary screening phase.

- The Review Board issued a work plan for these assessments on September 27, 2005.
- The Review Board decided that it would tailor its typical environmental assessment process to match the scale and type of these development projects.
- At the time, the Review Board had recently completed a number of environmental assessments of similar mineral exploration projects in the general vicinity of where Sidon and Consolidated Gold Win Ventures propose to drill.
- The Board gained a lot of experience and understanding of the issues associated with such projects through those EAs.
- The Board set out a two-phase process for the Sidon and CGV environmental assessments:
- **Phase One** would consist of a round of Information Requests and then a Hearing. This would help the Review Board to:

- clarify the scope of the development (what is it? where is it, How is it to be carried out?)
 - clarify the scope of the assessment
 - gauge the level of public concern and identify its sources; and
 - provide the Board with information to address the factors legally required for every EA.
- In the event that the Phase One did not provide the Board with sufficient evidence, **Phase Two** would be implemented.
 - This would consist of a typical EA process as described in our EIA Guidelines and would include a terms of reference, a developer's assessment report, information requests, and technical analysis reports.

Looking back at key events in the EA:

- In the initial workplan the Review Board issued information requests and set a proposed hearing date of December 6th, 2005.
- However on November 9th, 2005 the Review Board stated in a ruling that the Information

Request responses it had received from the Developers were insufficient to permit a hearing to be conducted at that time. The Hearing was thus postponed until the necessary information was provided.

- The Developers submitted revised Information Requests responses in February of 2006. After examining the submissions, the Review Board determined that the responses were still inadequate; the hearing was not rescheduled.
- In July, 2006, the Review Board contacted the Presidents of the companies to verify if they intended to continue to participate in the EA process. The Developers responded that they were. The Developers' Information Request responses were resubmitted in early November 2006.
- The Review Board then began planning for this public hearing and set hearing dates.

Combined Hearings

- Initially, the Review Board had decided to hold hearings for each of these two projects on

separate days, because the Board has maintained separate records for both of these projects.

- At the Pre-Hearing conference in March, Parties told the Review Board that it would be better to combine the hearings, because of similar concerns of a cumulative nature.
- The Board agreed with this suggestion, which is why we are dealing with the two projects today and tomorrow in a combined hearing.
- The Review Board understands that these two projects are similar types of developments in the same general area, and that many of the concerns expressed on the record are common to both projects. That is part of the reason for combining the hearings.
- Unless we hear otherwise, the Board will assume that the comments it hears today apply to both projects.
- **It must be made clear to those persons who intend to present today, that if you have specific concerns that apply to only**

one company, or only to one proposed drilling site, those people should be very clear in stating this.

- The Review Board members or staff may ask questions to you, if they feel they need some clarity regarding this.