

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXCEL TEMPLATE:**

1. Do not leave blank rows above or between comments.
2. Do not modify or delete the instructions or the column headings (*i.e.* the grey areas).
3. Each comment must have an associated topic and recommendation.
4. All formatting (*i.e.* bullets) will be lost when this file is uploaded to the Online Comment Table.
5. If necessary, adjust the cell width and height in order to view all text.
6. Cutting and pasting comments from WORD documents cannot include hard returns (spaces between paragraphs).
7. If you would like to create paragraphs within a single cell, please use a proper carriage return (ALT & ENTER).

<u>TOPIC</u> <i>Be as specific as you think is appropriate; for example a section or page of the document, a recommendation #, general comment, etc.</i>	<u>COMMENT</u> <i>Comments should contain all the information needed for the proponent and the Board to understand the rationale for the accompanying recommendation.</i>	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u> <i>Recommendations can be for the proponent or for the Board. Recommendations should be as specific as possible, relating the issues raised in the "comment" column to an action that you believe is necessary.</i>
Update RECLAIM model calculations--s. 7 Updates to the ICRP, pg. 19	DDEC has committed to providing an “updated RECLAIM model to the WLWB shortly after receipt of the WLWB’s decision on the proposed changes to security” (2013 Progress Report, pg. 19). Very few details of how the proposed changes to the ICRP and financial security are provided other than calculated increases or decreases. It is the position of the Agency that DDEC should submit an updated output from the RECLAIM model to support the proposed changes to financial security as requested.	The WLWB should direct DDEC to provide an updated output from the RECLAIM model to support the proposed changes to the ICRP and/or financial security. This should become a standing requirement for all future Progress Reports.

<p>Compliance with Posting Security--s. 7 Updates to the ICRP, pg. 19</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the company has complied with W2009L2-0001, Part C (Conditions Applying to Security Deposits), item 1. This section of the current water licence for Ekati reads as follows:</p> <p>The Licensee shall post and maintain a security deposit in accordance with Schedule 2, Item 1.</p> <p>The Agency wrote to Ministers Valcourt and Miltenberger on January 21, 2014 regarding the existing large gap in financial security for the Ekati Mine and the delays in posting of security. We have not yet had a reply and firmly believe that DDEC needs to comply with the water licence as issued on July 30, 2013 before any further consideration of a reduction in financial security is entertained.</p>	<p>The WLWB give no further consideration to changes in the financial security until there is evidence that DDEC has posted the necessary financial security in compliance with the water licence.</p>
<p>Landfarm Surface Area--s. 7 Updates to the ICRP, pg. 20</p>	<p>DDEC overestimated the size of the landfarm by almost 9 times but provides no explanation as to how this happened. By implication, if the size of the landfarm is reduced, the size of the other portions of the waste rock pile would likely increase and still require capping, but this is not explained or accounted for with increased capping costs for the other portions.</p>	<p>DDEC should provide an explanation as to the overestimation of the landfarm area. DDEC should also clarify whether a reduction in the landfarm size will increase the size of the other parts of the waste rock pile that may require capping, and how this will affect the cost estimate and financial security.</p>

<p>Landfill Capping Depth--s. 7 Updates to the ICRP, pg. 21</p>	<p>The Agency cannot support the reduction in landfill capping without additional information. It is not clear whether a 1 m cap will provide long-term protection and a barrier to prevent wildlife from accessing landfill materials or to protect against erosion, settling, frost heave and ice jacking. There is no information provided on the potential for leachate from the landfill areas if the cap is reduced to 1 m and this area becomes part of the active layer.</p> <p>DDEC states "Rather than full permafrost encapsulation DDEC considers stabilization of inert landfill materials to prevent wind and water erosion and to promote wildlife and human safety as a more appropriate cover objective. The planning estimate for a physical stabilization cover is 1 m of granite rock". It is not explained why a 1 m cover depth is more effective at achieving physical stability than the original, collaboratively agreed-upon 5 m depth.</p>	<p>DDEC should provide additional information to support the reduction of the landfill cover from 5 m to 1 m. DDEC should provide addition information as to whether a 1 m cap will provide long-term protection and a barrier to prevent wildlife from accessing landfill materials. Information should be submitted as to whether a 1 m cap will protect against erosion, settling, frost heave and ice jacking. Information should be submitted on potential for leachate from the active layer within the landfill areas if there is only a 1 m cover.</p>
<p>Pit Flooding Plan--s. 7 Updates to the ICRP, pg. 21</p>	<p>It is not clear to the Agency whether and how DDEC will place a clean water cap on the Fox pit lake, assuming that it is filled with LLCF Cell D water. We have no scientific basis for suggesting that use of Cell D water for Fox pit refilling is inherently a bad idea. Any problems would most likely arise during the actual flooding so we would advocate having a good Adaptive Management Plan in place for any contingencies or unpredicted events including poor water quality. The Agency would like to know whether the decrease in water depth (up to 0.10 m) in the channels downstream of the LLCF may be significant to fish or other aquatic species. We wonder how much spawning and nursery habitat for stream spawners (e.g., grayling) will be reduced or eliminated during the 15 years of Fox pit filling. It is not clear how a potential blocking of fish migration between lakes may impact fish populations downstream of the LLCF.</p>	<p>The WLWB should direct DDEC to prepare an Adaptive Management Plan, for Board approval, in advance of any use of Cell D water for Fox pit filling. The Plan should ensure there are contingencies and management responses in place should there be unpredicted events and/or poor water quality. DDEC should provide information on the impacts on aquatic life (especially fish spawning and nursery habitat) of reduced water flow downstream of the LLCF for the 15 years of Fox pit filling.</p>