


GEOFIN

Geological & Financial
Consulting Services



Ste 302 – 15015 Victoria Ave.
White Rock, BC V4B 1G2
Tel 604-542-2691 Cell 604 780-7659

Consolidated GoldWin Ventures
And
Sidon International Resource Corp.
Suite 1016 - 470 Granville St.
Vancouver British Columbia
V6C 1V5

And

Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact
Review Board

Box 938 – 5102- 50th Avenue
Yellowknife NWT
X1A 2N7

December 14, 2005

BY Courier

RE: MV2003C0003 Land Use Permit Amendment Application and New Land Use Application
Consolidated Goldwin Ventures Inc.

AND

RE: MV2004C0039 Land Use Permit Application
Sidon International Resource Corp.

Dear Mr Sirs,

Subsequent to Mr. Farrage's telephone conversation from Mr. Erlich to resubmit the application, please find attached the IR's answered in more detail, the adapted submission for both companies based on the IR's and discussions presented and aired at the November 2003 public meeting which address most if not all the issues raised in the current IR's and finally the MVEIRB's final report which did address all the issues raised.

I have referenced in each of the IR's the appropriate pages in both the Adapted Submission (AS) and the Final Report (FR) for easy verification.

[Note: the Final report cited is the one for the New Shoshoni Ventures as I no longer have the one for Consolidated Goldwin Ventures. However since they both cover the same issues and except for the MVEIRB's conclusion are pretty close in content]


Trusting that this information answers the concerns raised.

Sincerely



Glen Macdonald P.Geo.

**Information Requests
Sidon Int'l Resources Corp.
EA 0506 006**



IR Number: 1.3
Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board
To: Sidon Int'l Resources Corp.
Subject: Project Description

Preamble

Descriptions of the proposed development submitted by Sidon have helped to clarify the proposed development. In the Modified Developer's Assessment Report, Sidon states that "All the potential drill site areas appear to be located in areas that First Nations have identified as having no significance".

Request

- a. **In order to state that all potential drill locations have been identified by First Nations as having no significance, you must know all your potential drill sites. Which of your drilling targets are on ice, and which are on land? Where exactly is each located? Please list these individually, and describe in as much detail as possible.** Can't be done.

b.

Due to the uncertainties revolving around the process of getting a simple 2- 3 week drill program approved in the NWT, that in the past took 1 -2 months at the most and which impacted the area as negligibly as this proposed work program, and which was well discussed in 2003 when our first permit was approved, no work program can be, in good conscious, recommended until it is apparent that drilling of the defined zone can be completed. We will conduct the defining work once the LUP, as recommended by the MVLWB is issued.

AS pages 1-2 & 3; Table 1

FR General Comment Section 1.2.1 - This area is not part of the initial area of concern but an area slightly to the east on the same lake was identified and commented on during the regional study of the area for all three companies, particularly Snowfield Development's 2004 hearing and subsequent permit issuance.

c. Where have First Nations identified that all of your proposed drill sites are areas of no significance? Please identify your exact source.

I reviewed the report filed with the public documents in 2003. To my knowledge none of the sites that were "possible sites" have been confirmed in the finally report due in March of 2004 as bona fide archeological sites. In fact it is my understanding that the same author returned to the area of Drybones Bay proper this past summer and found no new sites in the area of the proposed drilling by New Shoshoni that were a good part of the basis of the MVEIRB recommendations in 2004.

Be that as it may there were no sites identified in the vicinity of Defeat Lake. My recollection is that on the YKDFN maps no main trails even passed through Defeat Lake.

This was addressed by Snowfield's Development in the their issued LUP on the east side of the lake.

Contrary to conclusion of the MVEIRB in the FR and work completed today by Snowfield Developments, Consolidated Goldwin Ventures and the report (2005) completed by Calum Thompson (above) for New Shoshoni, no sites discovered affected or reported by the exploration work or any other work.

However if there is information that there are sites there and we will avoid them as per the rules and regulations in effect.

- AS Section C-2 (page 6); Section D-1 & D-2 (pages 8 & 9); pages 11-12; Table 4; Section H (page 13); Section I (page 14).
- FR Section 1.2.1 - all areas of significance referred to GSL claims (wher a LUP was issued)
Section 1.2.2 - Describes process.

IR Number: 1.4
Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board
To: Sidon Int'l Resources Corp.
Subject: Project Description

Preamble

In Land Use Application MV2004C0039, Sidon states that “drill cuttings will be blended into area till”. In the Modified Developer’s Assessment Report, Sidon states in section E-2 that cuttings will be “placed into an approved depression well removed from waterbodies”.

Request

- a. Will drill cuttings be blended into area till, placed into a “suitable depression”, or both? Please clarify.**
- b. If Sidon plans to place cuttings into “an approved depression well removed from waterbodies”, whose approval is Sidon referring to?**
- c. If Sidon plans to place cuttings into “an approved depression well removed from waterbodies”, what is the minimum distance in meters that Sidon considers to be “well removed” from surface waters?**

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting. It was addressed by Snowfield's Development in the their issued LUP. It was addressed in the issued LUP to Consolidated Goldwin.

It was in practice last year when Consolidated Goldwin drilled on the area to the east of Drybones Bay and on the east of Defeat Lake. The approval is granted by the same bodies that approved last year's work and Snowfield Development's work. The distance that this benign natural occurring rock "debris" will be as outlined in the regulations of the NWT, that drill companies have been using without problem.

AS Section C-4 (page 8); Section E-2 (page 9)
FR Section 2.4.1 - All questions clearly discussed.

IR Number: 1.5
Source: Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board
To: Sidon Int'l Resources Corp.
Subject: Fish Habitat and Impact Mitigation

Preamble

Our review of the application and scope of the proposed work does not provide specific delineation of the drill sites within specific bodies of water. Maps provided by the developer include sites on around Defeat Lake, a fish-bearing water body.

The company should describe the process they will use to protect fish habitat. Mitigation such as drilling in areas frozen to the substrate or in deep water is not described.

Request

- a. Please describe the process that will be employed to identify sensitive fish habitat such as spawning shoals when potential drill sites are delineated and the process that will be used to determine the volume or depth of water in various other lakes and ponds.**
- b. Please describe specific mitigation measures.**

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting. It was addressed by Snowfield's Development in the their issued LUP. It was addressed in the issued LUP to Consolidated Goldwin.

However, if the DFO has some new information to add to the regulations and rules that we need to follow, we will comply.

AS Section C-2 (page 6); Section J-1 & J-2 (page 23)
FR Section 2.4.2 - discussed; Conclusion Section 4.3.1 - discussed - no impact

IR Number: 1.6
Source: Yellowknives Dene First Nation
To: Sidon Int'l Resources Corp.
Subject: Consultation

Preamble

In the opinion of YKDFN (as expressed in its proposed IR submission),

Mr. Lawrence Stephenson outlines what it calls "consultation efforts." The Yellowknives Dene do not consider Mr. Stephenson's effort to be consultation. The demonstrated efforts do not even meet the minimum threshold of discussion.

It is important to emphasise that Mr. Stephenson has not communicated with the YKDFN or its consultants. That is unfortunate because exploration and mining companies working in the NWT that have made a genuine effort to consult the YKDFN have been able to do so. We have found members of the Chamber of Mines to be an informed group and generally consultative and encourage Mr. Stephenson to draw on the Chambers knowledgeable members.

FR Section 2.5.2 - discussed

Request

- 1. Please provide the Review Board with Sidon's policies with respect to "consultation with First Nations" as it applies in the NWT.**

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting.

AS Section C-2 (page 6); pages 23-24

- 2. Has Sidon chosen not to consult the YKDFN because it is of the opinion that such consultation is the responsibility of the government of Canada?**

We have consulted with and will continue to consult with the YKDFN as demonstrated.

AS Section C-2 (page 6); pages 23-24

FR Section 2.5.2 - discussed

- 3. Please provide the Review Board information about what Sidon is willing to commit to with regard to on-going meaningful consultation with the YKDFN.**

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting.. It was demonstrated by Consolidated Goldwin under its issued LUP.

AS Section C-2 (page 6); pages 23-24; Table 4.

4. Please provide information about what other First Nations Sidon has consulted in the NWT and in Canada within the last five years.

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting.

AS pages 3, 4 & 6; Table 4.

5. Please provide the Review Board information about what Sidon understands its role to be in the consultation and communication process with YKDFN during the regulatory process (eg. land use permit and water licensing processes)

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting.

AS Section C-2 (page 6); Table 2; Table 4; page 11.

6. Please provide information about what regulatory authorities were contacted in the NWT before applying for the development authorizations. (e.g., was DFO contacted? Was Indian and Northern Affairs contacted?)

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting. It is not prescribed in the LUP application process as demonstrated by the MVLWB's approval of the LUP.

AS Table 2; page 11.

IR Number: 1.7
Source: Yellowknives Dene First Nation
To: Sidon Int'l Resources Corp.
Subject: Cultural Impacts

Preamble

In the opinion of YKDFN (as expressed in its proposed IR submission),

Sidon... suggests there is no culturally important or heritage sites identified in the areas where (it) proposes work. That is not the case as noted by the Prince of Wales Heritage Centre. The developers are asked to respond to the following questions.

Request

- 1. Respecting the significant cultural significance of the proposed development areas and the associated cultural landscape, are the developers prepared to accommodate YKDFN needs regarding the full protection of the areas?**

This was addressed with considerable detail at the 2003 public meeting. In the final report of the MVEIRB in 2004 on the issuance of Consolidated Goldwin's LUP and in the issuance of Snowfield Development's LUP much later that year, all these matters were addressed. Other than that we have no jurisdiction to comment.

AS - Table 4, Section C-2 (page 6), Section G (page 11); Section I (page 14); Table 4

- 2. Over the years, cultural, economic and social factors have led to the development of distinct cultural landscapes in and around proposed development area. Through centuries, the local inhabitants perpetuated this cultural landscape through subsistence interaction with the natural resources through consensus-driven institutions. The YKDFN has recently experienced profound changes in its social, cultural, administrative and technical conditions. Are the developers prepared to work with the YKDFN over an extended period of time in order to ensure the resulting cultural landscape continues to reflect the local identity of the place and residents and represents the regional characteristics of YKDFN?**

Please see the answer to the first section.

AS Section G-2 (page 11); Section I (page 15); Table 4.

- 3. Does Sidon accept that the areas where it proposes to undertake development has value at a cultural landscape level? YES. If Sidon concludes the areas do not have a significant cumulative cultural landscape value, please provide information used to arrive at that conclusion.**

FR - Conclusion - Section 4.4 - Now based on NSV, CGW and SDC reports, concerns mitigated, and all companies have demonstrated working with YKDFN
Also FR - Section 4.4.2

IR number: 1.8

Source: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)

To: Sidon International Resources Corp.

Subject: Camp sewage and greywater disposal

Preamble

The Land Use Permit (LUP) application mentions the possibility of a small camp setup (4-6 people) at Moose Bay on Great Slave Lake. If a camp is established on the ice INAC needs clarification on how/where sewage and greywater from the camp will be disposed of. The original LUP application states in section 9-B that sewage and greywater will be allowed to "settle and returned to natural state". The Modified Development Assessment Report (MDAR) states that all wastes will be transported back to Yellowknife. If waste is to be disposed of in the area of the camp the following should be noted: (a) waste should undergo a minimum of primary treatment to remove all suspended solids and floatable materials; (b) there should be no discharge of floating solids, garbage, grease, free oil or foam; (c) discharge of the effluent should take place in a diffuse manner to self-contained areas with minimal slope; and (d) all discharges must occur at least 100m from any waterbody. The preferred method of wastewater treatment for the camp would be a secondary or tertiary treatment system that would allow for the treated waste to be spread to the land surface.

Request

Please provide details on the method of sewage and greywater waste disposal at the proposed temporary work camp at Moose Bay on Great Slave Lake.

If waste is to be disposed of in the area of the possible temporary camp the company will: (a) the waste will undergo a minimum of primary treatment to remove all suspended solids and floatable materials; (b) there will be no discharge of floating solids, garbage, grease, free oil or foam; (c) discharge of the effluent will take place in a diffuse manner to self-contained areas with minimal slope; and (d) all discharges will occur at least 100m from any waterbody. The preferred method of wastewater treatment for the camp would be a secondary or tertiary treatment system that would allow for the treated waste to be spread to the land surface.

The company will comply with all the regulations and rules in place.

AS - Section C-4 & C-5 (page 8); Section E-2 (page 9)

FR - Section 2.4.1 - discussed

IR number: 1.9

Source: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)

To: Sidon International Resources Corp.

Subject: Camp location

Preamble

Sidon International Resources Corp. has proposed setting up a temporary work camp on the ice at Moose Bay on Great Slave Lake. Situating a work camp on an ice surface can be problematic and precautions should be taken to minimize risk involved. A plan for camp location, including minimum measures of ice thickness, should be noted in the application. In addition, heated cabins will have an effect on the integrity and thickness of the ice surface. Cabins should be positioned to allow convective cooling beneath the cabin. An emergency plan should be established and all workers should be informed of protocol for dealing with ice associated dangers.

Request

Please provide details of the camp location and services. We don't know yet. However it will comply with all regulations and rules if it is needed, including minimum measurements of ice thickness, should the temporary camp be established. In addition, should heated cabins be used, they will be positioned to allow convective cooling beneath the cabin. An emergency plan will be established and all workers will be informed of protocol for dealing with ice associated dangers.

We will address it in the same way Snowfield Development did with its approved LUP.

In addition please include a plan for dealing with ice associated dangers.

We will address it in the same way Snowfield Development did with its approved LUP. We will follow the established practices conducted in the NWT for the past 100 or so years.

AS - Section C-2 & C-3 (page 6)

FR - Section 2.4.2 - discussed

IR number: 1.10

Source: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)

To: Sidon Resources International Corp.

Subject: Land Use

Preamble

INAC, Land Administration and Mining Records office has identified that a seasonal recreational lease in the area in the name of Clarence Brown is present on the north east shore of Defeat Lake, on Lot 1013, UTM Coordinates 12365263mE and 6916561mN, or approximately 62 degrees 21' North – 113 degrees 36' W.

Request

Has the lessee, Clarence Brown on Defeat Lake been consulted with regards to this proposed operation near his leased site?

Why?

He only has leased the surface rights - they are quite removed from the mineral tenure that we are developing. At this stage of the exploration program and into the foreseeable future the likelihood of even being in the region at the same time is remote.

This would also have been covered in the Snowfield Development application and subsequent issued LUP which is substantially closer to his location. I would assume that what ever was required of their LUP would be applicable to this one.