



Mount Polley Mining Corporation
an Imperial Metals company
Box 12 • Likely, BC V0L 1N0 • T 250.790.2215 • F 250.790.2613

MOUNT POLLEY MINING CORPORATION (MPMC) PUBLIC LIAISON COMMITTEE (PLC)

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Details

Conference Call Meeting – General Meeting
October 7, 2020
9:00 am to 12:30 pm

Meeting called by: MPMC Designated Representation
Meeting Chaired by: MPMC Designated Representation

PLC Members and Guests

Member	Present	Call-in	Organization
Bee Hooker			Big Lake Community
Bill Carruthers			Williams Lake Community
Lyn Anglin			Consultant to Imperial Metals
Christine McLean			Mitchell Bay Community
Claudine Kadonaga			Likely Business
Mathieu O'Leary (MO)		x	Mount Polley Mining Corporation
Dale Reimer			Mount Polley Mining Corporation
Carol Danyluk (CD)		x	Ministry of Environment
Don Parsons (DP)		x	Imperial Metals
Doug Watt (DW)		x	Likely Citizen
Edna Boston		x	Xatsull - Soda Creek Indian Band
Alan Gibson (AG)		x	Ministry of Environment
Jackie Sarginson			MLA Cariboo North Coralee Oaks Office
Jaylyn Byer (Alternate)			Williams Lake Chamber of Commerce
Linda Bartsch			Horsefly Business
Lisa Kraus		x	Likely Community

Lowell Constable			Ministry of Energy, Mines, and Petroleum Resources
Maureen LeBourdais			Cariboo Regional District
Micky McIntosh			Likely Resident
Richard Holmes			Morehead Community
Steve Hocquard			Horsefly Community
Gabe Holmes (GH)		x	Mount Polley Mining Corporation
Walt Cobb		x	City of Williams Lake
Alicia Lalonde (AL)		x	DWB Consulting
Abhirosh Chandran (AC)		x	Ministry of Environment
Aaron Higginbottom		x	Williams Lake First Nation
Guests	Onsite	Call-in	Organization
Alex Gresl		x	Williams Lake Chamber of Commerce
Dylan Sellars		x	Williams Lake First Nation
Nishitha Singi		x	Williams Lake First Nation

Conference Call Meeting/Presentations 9:00am to 1:00pm Meeting Notes

Welcome and Roll Call on Phone

- No objections to Alex Gresl or Nishitha Singi sitting in on the meeting

Additions to Agenda

- Update on Environmental Appeal of the last permit amendment

Approval of Agenda

- Approved

MPMC Discussion Items (see 2020-10-07 PLC Meeting Presentation)

- Care and Maintenance Update
- COVID-19 Update
- PLC Membership Review
- Environmental Monitoring Update
 - CEMP sample site changes
- Discharge/WTP Update
- Water Management Update
- Remediation Update
- Exploration Update

- ENV/EMPR Discussion
 - Review EMA Permit 11678 Inspection Warning Letter

Standing Agenda Items

- Roundtable Discussion
- PLC Questions/Comments

Next Meeting

Care and Maintenance Update- Gabriel Holmes

- Care and Maintenance operations include daily inspections of water management infrastructure, monitoring of the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) to ensure proper operation, environmental monitoring including water sampling, reporting, and planning for the upcoming months, exploration, remediation construction, site improvements, open air tours, road building materials for MOT and CANMAG facility
 - CANMAG has concluded operations and is now transporting magnetite off-site
 - Site tours- community meeting held on Aug 26, 2020 and Habitat Remediation Working Group (HRWG) meeting on Sept 29, 2020 in Lower Hazeltine Creek

COVID19 Update- Gabriel Holmes

- COVID policies for the mine site are still in place.
- As of March 19, all personnel at the mine site must: practice social distancing, frequently wash hands, practice safe sneeze/cough etiquette, wear a face mask while in a vehicle with others, stay home if feeling sick, keep hands away from eyes, nose and mouth, and keep work areas and tools clean and hygienic.
- Implementation of room occupancy limits and additional cleaning requirements. A questionnaire must be filled out upon arrival onsite and people will be turned away if they show symptoms of illness.

PLC Membership Review- Gabriel Holmes

- There are a number of vacancies in allotted seats as per the PLC Terms of Reference
 - BC Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation- 1 seat
 - BC Ministry of Agriculture- 1 seat
 - BC Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations- 1 seat
 - BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure- 1 seat
 - Interior Health Authority- 1 seat
 - Environment and Climate Change Canada- 1 seat
 - Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada- 1 seat
 - University of Northern BC- 1 seat, offer declined
 - Environmental Advocacy Group- 1 seat remaining

- United Steel Workers Union- 1 seat
- MPMC Employee Representative- 1 seat
- The Interested Public- 1 seat
- Fraser Basin Council- offer declined

GH to reach out to other Ministries for interested parties as it would be valuable to have additional Ministry representation at the PLC meetings.

CD expressed interest in inviting a representative from the Mining Institute of Canada.

MO suggested a participant from Gibraltar Mine as there may be some crossover benefit.

MPMC has been in contact with the Fraser Basin Council as they have requested a presentation. MPMC will do the presentation and pursue having them on the PLC.

Environmental Monitoring Update- Gabriel Holmes

- Water sampling of Polley Lake, Bootjack Lake, Quesnel Lake, Hazeltine Creek, Edney Creek, mine site seepage, groundwater and the WTP is conducted, routine weekly, monthly, quarterly, semi-annual sampling as per the CEMP
 - Annual changes to CEMP monitoring locations in remediated areas- due to changes in lower Hazeltine Creek from construction, sample location HAC-01c no longer exists, will sample HAC-08 and EDC-01 more frequently going forward
 - Hydrology station H3 was removed during construction in lower Hazeltine Creek- need to install a new station which will be called H3a, will establish a stage discharge curve for that site once it is installed

DW: When monitoring stations are changed, is the MOE consulted?

AG: These changes have not been brought to the ENV; they should have been discussed as part of CEMP update review.

GH: HAC-01c was always planned to be removed; however, we should have notified you.

AG: The CEMP is a permit condition so MPMC needs to send notification that changes are being made. It is not sufficient to just include changes in a monthly report.

GH: We should have made it more evident that those sites were going to change.

CD: There is an advantage if you have not chosen the site for the new hydrology station- our hydrologist can be consulted with for options.

GH: Construction just concluded yesterday. I will put together documentation and send it.

CD: If you send the documentation to Alan and myself, we can forward it to Erin Rainy and she can consult on it if she has time.

AG: Provide ENV with notification in writing with justification for the changes in CEMP.

GH: Alicia and I will provide requested changes in writing.

CD: It is not unexpected that monitoring locations have to change as a result of remediation, but you do need to put changes in writing and submit so that we can give approval.

- Surveys and studies
 - Dilution modeling looking at concentrations exceeding 1% at 100m and 250m from end of pipe in Quesnel Lake as per the Metal and Diamond Mining Effluent Regulations (MDMER)- DWB Consulting
 - Fish population and tissue studies- Minnow Environmental
 - Zooplankton and phytoplankton sampling- Minnow Environmental
 - Creek and lake sediment, benthic invertebrate studies- Minnow Environmental
 - Constructed Wetland Treatment System (CWTS)- Ensero, biweekly and monthly sampling requirements completed by MPMC
 - Environmental Effects Monitoring (EEM) Phase 3 study design- Minnow Environmental
 - Saturated Rock Fill (SRF) bench scale test- Golder Associates

AG: Is it just SRF and CWTS going on right now?

GH: Yes, just those two.

AG: Will those two be sufficient to treat all Mount Polley's contact water after 2022?

GH: The systems are still being assessed. There have been positive results; however, we aren't sure if they will be scaled up to the mine site level at this time.

AG: Can you provide an update on water treatment technologies?

DP: Golder was not invited to this meeting. We are looking at pit lake and active treatment with lime as well.

AG: Lime was being used before correct?

DP: Yes, when mine was in operation. The status of test work going on is outlined in Progress Report #6.

AG: Yes, I was just wondering how things are moving along.

GH: We are completing field work on the wetlands this month, and annual reports will be distributed early next year. We can request an update on the status of the CWTS and SRF prior to Progress Report submission in December.

AG: I just want to make sure that everyone knows what's happening. There are a lot of documents being submitted and not everyone can keep up with those. These meetings are a good opportunity to present information about what is being done.

AG: The dilution modelling is out of the diffusers in Quesnel Lake?

GH: Yes, the question we needed to answer was does effluent exceed 1% at 100m and 250m from diffusers? The MDMER indicates that if previous Phase 1 and 2 studies show no effect on fish and effluent does not exceed 1% at 100m and 250m from the diffusers, the Phase 3 study design does not need to include the fish component.

AG: Is that part of your federal permit? Our guidelines are stricter.

GH: Minnow heads that up and takes care of the MDMER requirements. There is a fish component of our CEMP and that work will continue to be conducted.

- Sump and ditch inspections
 - Permit 11678 requirement
 - Completed twice annually in all critical ditches, sumps, ponds and pipelines

- Physically walk around the ditch/sump/pond/pipeline and look for settling, erosion and obstructions that will impede the infrastructure from operating as intended

CD: Twice annual seep surveys- can you briefly describe how those are done?

GH: Part of the M-200 permit is to understand mine site seepage. We implemented a survey and sample program in 2013 which involves us physically walking the toes of dumps and any areas where there is significant waste rock, and identifying seepage sources. Once identified, they are named, GPS coordinates taken and samples collected. Those sites are sampled twice per year, once in the spring and once in the fall. As dumps change and settle, the point sources of seepage change and the sampling locations change. We have had 90 sites but only sample approximately 40 now. The twice annual sampling gives a snapshot of water that is reporting to the collection ditches. We utilize that info for predictive modelling.

CD: How long does it take to complete one survey and what time of year are they done?

GH: Spring freshet surveys are done in May/June and fall are completed around this time (October). It takes two people approximately 10-14 days to complete all sites.

AG: When doing sump and ditch inspections did you notice any erosion from freshet this spring?

GH: The Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) clean water diversion ditch which diverts water from southwest side of TSF did blow out and start dumping water into TSF. It was identified during the spring inspection and was repaired. It has not been inspected yet this fall.

AG: So, there was no big damage from this years' freshet?

GH: No. There was also a bit of erosion from Bootjack Sump from the unauthorized discharge that occurred in April.

- Seep surveys
 - Sample all significant seepage sources from toes of dumps and roads
 - If there is visible flow and we can get a sample that is not contaminated by soil, the seep is sampled

AG: All seeps are collected and pumped back into Perimeter Embankment Till Borrow Pond (PETBP) or TSF?

GH: Yes, that is the purpose of our collection system.

DW: Are any seeps elevated in metals?

GH: Yes, to a certain degree they all are. NEZ Seep 1 and 2 are monitored more frequently than all other seeps as the water chemistry changed over 5 years and is not typical of the other seeps around the site. Shauna Litke did a thesis on those seeps.

DP: Shauna identified that the sulphur pile was contributing to the lower pH water going through the old east dump and to the NEZ seep. The next steps were to move the sulphur pile to the heap leach pad and monitor water levels in the heap leach pad closely. Water levels are kept low by pumping leachate to the mill for lime treatment. Following treatment, the leachate is sent to the TSF. We are monitoring those seeps to see if the elevated copper levels remain. If water continues to be high in copper in those seeps, we will dig out some material from the base of the old sulphur pile and replace it with limestone.

GH: Those seeps are managed independently from other mine contact water because of the elevated copper. We've had a least one occurrence where water has gone to the PETBP resulting in exceedances in the WTP. It is imperative that that water is managed separately. It currently is directed to the Wight Pit.

- Reporting and Planning

- Monthly, quarterly and annual reports

- CEMP execution

- In house planning

- Coordinate with consultants for specialized work

- *EMA Permit 11678 Inspection Report- Warning Letter- Out of compliance on a number of items, MPMC provided the following responses to the out of compliance items:*

- A pressurized tailings discharge line developed a 3" hole, spraying approximately 200L of tailings onto a haul road and the west ditch, bypassing the TSF- MPMC will ensure there are no bypasses of the authorize works unless the approval of the Director is obtained in writing.

- Emergency Response Plan (ERP) was not submitted for 2019- The requirement to submit an updated ERP annually was not retained in the most recently amended permit; therefore, no further action is required.

- A draft water management plan was not completed and submitted by Dec 1, 2019- A draft permit amendment sent by ECCC to stakeholders on September 11, 2019 did not include the December 1, 2019 deadline for the final water management plan. The draft permit amendment included Section 2.10 which stipulated a December 1, 2020 deadline for the 2022 Water Management Plan and implementation schedule. In a call between Lee Nikl and James Ogilvie of Golder Associates, and Alan Gibson of ECCC on October 29, 2019, Golder notified ECCC that MPMC would not meet the December 1, 2019 deadline and asked if a formal request for an extension needed to be filed should the permit amendment not be issued by that date. Alan's response was that he would contact Carol Danyluk and get back to MPMC. No response was received from Alan and the permit amendment was issued on February 1, 2020. MPMC will ensure that the 2022 Water Management Plan and implementation schedule are submitted for approval prior to December 1, 2020. Golder Associates is currently in the process of drafting the aforementioned deliverables.

- Sampling errors- One sample was missed at the WTP, MPMC sampled twice that week but did not sample HAD-3 and QUL-57, 58 and 59 on the same day as required; not taking a sample BT at QUL-57 or a sample BT, BP or B at QUL-58 - we are required to sample 57, 58 and 59 at the same depths; however, QUL-57 is only 25m to the bottom so we cannot sample BT or BP at this location at times, we need to address this in the CEMP at some point as there will continue to be compliancy issues; Q1 and Q2 toxicity samples- *P. subcapitata* was not conducted and was a mistake on our part- MPMC has resolved these issues.

- Did not report results for some collection ditches onsite in the annual report- That was a reporting error, we have submitted the results to ENV and resolved this issue.
- Weather stations- only partial data was provided for Weather station #2 due to ongoing issues, we have all issues resolved at this time.
- Spilled tailings as mentioned above- MPMC did not immediately notify Director of the non-compliance or provide a follow up report, both actions will be taken for any future incidents.

DW: I could not find this inspection report online and cannot access the PLC Sharepoint site.

GH: We will follow up on that.

Action Item: Follow up with IT about Sharepoint site access.

GH: Do our responses get posted to website as well?

CD: We don't work directly with the compliance team; however, the last time that this question was asked, we were told that we do not post responses on the Ministry website. The response is taken into consideration if escalated compliance response is required.

GH: We can send our responses to the PLC.


Action Item: Send out MPMC's responses to the inspection report

AG: A different proxy station used during this year's freshet?

GH: No, that was just for reference.

Discharge/WTP Update- Gabriel Holmes

- The WTP discharged continuously through Q3
- Average daily discharge of 16,850 m³/day
 - Authorized annual average rate of discharge is 29,000 m³/day
 - Maximum rate of discharge is 52,000 m³/day
 - Recent phosphorus exceedance associated with inputs from Hazeltine and Edney Creeks



- As presented in the graph above, we have been below the total copper permit limit since the end of June and the WTP reduces total copper by roughly half

AG: Have any upgrades been done to the WTP?

MO: No upgrades have been done; we have been operating as per OMS manual.

CD: What does the purple line in the graph represent?

GH: Dissolved copper of the influent.

AG: The NPM level is not shown?

GH: No, it is not.

AG: There is water being stored in the Springer and Cariboo Pits from this year's freshet. Did that water come from the TSF?

MO: Yes, that's correct.

- Quesnel Lake
 - EEM Phase 3 Study Design is being developed
 - Fish population study will be discontinued as per MDMER Schedule 5, Part 2, Section 9. Previous study and modelling results indicate that the criteria have been met.

CD: What criteria have been met in the regulation?

GH: All of the criteria have been met to discontinue the fish population study.

AG: How does that apply to ENV's permit limits?

GH: I don't think it does, it's two separate studies that are reported differently.

AG: How do modeling results associate with permit limits?

GH: I'm not sure, I would have to speak to our Qualified Professional's at Minnow.

Water Management Update- Mathieu O'Leary

- Water storage on site
 - 1.83 Mm³ is being stored in the TSF
 - We are currently dewatering the dam in preparation for next year's freshet
 - Water is temporarily being stored in the Springer and Cariboo Pits- 2.81 Mm³ of water in the Springer Pit and 2.24 Mm³ of water in the Cariboo Pit
 - We stopped moving water into the pits in late July
 - Twice monthly water sampling is being conducted in both pits. Total copper levels appear to be decreasing with time.
 - The WTP has been running at full throughput
 - We are looking into approval for bypass for this water, and setting up infrastructure to move water from the Springer Pit to the WTP.

AG: I am working on other things so that I may not get to the bypass application right away.

AG: When you dewater the Cariboo and Springer Pits, you pump water into the West Ditch and Long Ditch?

MO: We are going to pump it to the Booster Station and into the Long Ditch as the West Ditch needs some work.

AG: The TSF can hold a lot of water. In the manual, it states that there is 8.9 Mm³ of available storage. How much of that could be water from freshet?

MO: Freshet can yield 3.0 Mm³ and there are 8.9 Mm³ available, but that is not a good operating value during care and maintenance. We are having a meeting to discuss this in the near future.

AG: Instead of discharging during freshet, you pumped all water to the TSF. Do you plan on storing water for this upcoming freshet instead of discharging?

MO: We plan on doing both. If we can't discharge, water will be stored on site.

GH: We may not be able to discharge water from collection ditches but we may be able to discharge from one of the pits if the infrastructure is present.

AG: Does the water in the TSF freeze over winter?

GH: Yes, except for the odd place.

AG: Do you start pumping down water in the TSF right now in preparation for next years freshet or do you wait?

MO: We started moving water at beginning of freshet in the spring. We are currently pumping water out of the TSF so that we can be below the operating parameter by next year's freshet.

Remediation Update- Gabriel Holmes

- Wrapped up the 2020 construction season yesterday- started on Jul 6 and completed on Oct 6
- Comprehensive fish salvage completed
- HRWG met and toured the site
- Design changes were incorporated based on HRWG input
- Key features
 - Instream habitat- pools, riffles, runs, floodplains, boulders, coarse woody debris
 - Removed sedimentation ponds
 - Reorienting Edney Creek
 - Conjoining Hazeltine and Edney Creeks
 - Constructing multiple outfalls
- Did not complete all the planned work in reaches 3 and 5, planning for 2021
- Outstanding work includes:
 - Upper Hazeltine- Polley Lake shoreline- soil cap and shore gravels; roads in Polley Flats; lower floodplain upstream of Gavin Lake Rd bridge
 - Middle Hazeltine- Lower floodplain in reach 3, including coarse woody debris, perching and denning habitat; “blowout” area; re-contour access roads (R2, R3, R4) to tree line
 - Lower Hazeltine Creek- Hazeltine Creek Reach 5; parking area

AG: Is there any other reclamation work that’s taken place other than at Hazeltine Creek?

GH: No. In 2018, I put together a plan for progressive reclamation of approximately 10 hectares but we have not pursued it yet due to budgetary constraints.

Exploration Update- Gabriel Holmes

- Completed work
 - Notice of Work (NOW) Application on Mineral Claims
 - Deemed Authorization Permit on Mine Permit Area
 - Geological mapping of “New” areas
 - Ground truthing of the exploration drill targets
 - Plan easiest, non-invasive access and diamond drill sites
 - Complete 3-D-IP over mine site known mineralization for new exploration and create fingerprint of known mineralized bodies
 - Diamond drill prioritized targets, MMI and Geophysical targets
 - Planned work- diamond drilling

AG: Don had mentioned that after one and a half years in care and maintenance, MPMC would make the decision about whether the mine would be started again. Will you be asking for permit amendment to extend this time?

DP: Yes, a permit amendment will be submitted to extend the timeframe for discharge until closure.

AG: Do you know when you're coming out of care and maintenance?

DP: We are looking at gold and copper prices. Art Frye is looking at a 7-year plan. The earliest start would be in line with the tasks that need to be completed in the mill, which would be at earliest spring 2021. COVID19 is affecting prices and that is why we're looking at a 7-year plan. We're hoping that exploration will add more reserves to mine plan. We are looking at modelling over 10 years.

DW: How is rehabilitation of the Springer Pit going? I thought you needed to have that cleaned out before mining starts again?

DP: Matt and the team is working on installing pipelines and collecting water samples. Water quality is below permit limits but not below the NPM. We are planning on dewatering the pit and hauling tailings out with trucks. We've had some conversations with Sean Shaw and it may be that we need to do some geotechnical work regarding how to get it onto the dumps.

DW: I would like to propose that the PLC request the Ministry of Energy and Mines present about the amalgamated permit at the next meeting.

GH: We can reach out to Sean and ask that he prepare a presentation for the next PLC meeting

Action Item: Request a presentation on the M-200 permit amalgamation from Sean for our next PLC meeting

AG: Aren't you using Springer Pit for the SRF test?

DP: No, maybe as a closure option when we relocate the PAG stockpile to the Springer Pit. We also have a lot of backfilled material in the Wight Pit. If we don't expand the Wight Pit, we could use the rock in there as a SRF. Golder has been given rock for the bench scale study but we do not have the results back yet. Those results should be included in Progress Report #7.

AG: Are you looking at a pilot scale test in Wight Pit or somewhere else then?

DP: Possibly, this is early on. There is a 16-month underground mine plan for the Wight Pit so it would be difficult to do the pilot scale study.

Compliance Review Update- Alan Gibson and Carol Danyluk

- EMA Permit 11678 Inspection Warning Letter
 - Outlines review of the MPMC 2019 Annual Environmental Report
 - "Out" of compliance issues are reviewed and resolved, if possible
 - Some out of compliance items cannot be resolved and will likely occur in the future
 - Quesnel Lake sample depths
 - Requirement to sample at same depths is often not achievable due to different site depths
 - Requirement to sample below plume is not achievable if the plume is at the bottom of the lake
 - Permit conditions change
- Other issues- 2019 CEMP submitted in Oct 2019, still not approved. New plan is due March 2023
 - If/when 2019 CEMP is approved, is a new plan due March 2023?
- ENV communication on aspects of monitoring plan that are planned to be discontinued

- Sediment toxicity testing in Polley Lake
- Variance to remove DGT monitoring from the plan
- *EMA* permit appeal

AG: I have done 4 other permit amendments in the last 6 months. We don't have enough staff to get everything done.

GH: All of the Ministries in the province are understaffed so I recognize the challenges that you face. It just creates a rocky outcome. We aren't using our most updated plan because it has not been approved yet though we are trying to incorporate the changes into our current sampling.

DP: We make recommendations for change, but are still stuck with costs for things that may not need to be done. We would like to cut down on the turnaround time to approve some of the changes in the CEMPs. Other mining companies may be working on old CEMPs and may be in the same situation as well.

CD: I'm in a meeting with senior leadership this afternoon to talk about this very concern.

GH: We recognize that you're in a difficult position and we are supportive of it.

CD: Abi can you give us an update as to where we're at with the 2019 CEMP?

AC: Our comments have been sent to the First Nations, now they are reviewing it and we are waiting for their comments.

CD: Every time we revise the CEMP, we have to do consultation.

Environmental Appeal for 11678 permit amendment

- DP: After the *EMA* permit amendment came out in February, we appealed Section 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10 to the Environmental Appeal Board. Doug applied to be a participant in the appeal and was approved. MPMC and ENV lawyers started settlement discussions. We arrived at some solution for most of the conditions we were appealing through a Consent Order issued on Sept 18. One section is still being challenged and will likely go to appeal and that is the NPM of 12 ppb. We are still challenging that and there will be pre-hearing meetings going forward.
- DW: Was allowed to be a participant but on discussions with the lawyers I was not allowed to participate.
- DP: Through discussion with ENV and Mount Polley, it was determined that you could not change a section of the permit that you had not applied to amend. We could still be in care and maintenance but be required to take the discharge out of Quesnel Lake unless we applied to amend Section 1.2.3 which we are now applying for. The other amendment we are applying for is the ability to bypass the WTP and discharge directly to Quesnel Lake.

Roundtable Discussion/PLC Comments/Questions

- CD: Regarding the appeal process, the other consideration is how the hearing will be heard given the COVID situation. There is a likelihood that the appeal may be heard by combination of written submission and virtual examination of evidence. An appeal where the evidence is presented in written submission may be advantageous. Just a comment. After the decision is made, the written evidence becomes part of the public record.
- DW: Alicia mentioned elevated phosphorus in Quesnel Lake, is there a report for that?
- GH: Needs to be reviewed but I can send it to the PLC once it has been finalized.

Action Item: Send June 29 Level 3 Investigation Report to the PLC

- DW: Earlier you mentioned a few leaks in tailings lines and that the lines are expected to wear. Going back a year ago to when you applied to reduce pressure testing on tailings lines, why do that if you are saying leaks are expected?
- GH: The pressure testing is for the pipeline into Quesnel Lake. The Quesnel Lake line is not a pressurized line and that's why we applied to have that requirement be removed.
- MO: It was a rupture and pressure testing probably wouldn't have identified that.
- EB: Could you email me this presentation?
- GH: Yes.

Action Item: Email presentation to the PLC membership

Next Meeting

- MO: Progress Report #7 is due at the end of December and our 2021 research plan is due on January 31, if we schedule for the week after we can present the 2021 workplan
- February 3, 2020, tentatively a conference call, depending on COVID situation we may be able to have it in Likely
- Discuss Hamilton paper at next meeting