

File

FROM
DE

A.C. Edwards

SUBJECT PROPOSED FEDERAL REGULATIONS ON ARSENIC FROM GOLD ROASTING
OBJET MEETING WITH GIANT YELLOWKNIFE MINES LTD .

On February 28, 1980 a meeting was convened at Giant Yellowknife Mines Ltd.
for the purpose of discussing the above regulations, soon to be promulgated.

PRESENT

Mr. C. Edwards	EPS, Edmonton
Mr. R. Kent	EPS, Yellowknife
Mr. K. Morton	Mill Superintendent, Giant
Mr. L. Connell	Mill Metallurgist, Giant

MINUTESIntroduction

Mr. Morton apologized for the absence of W. Moore, Mine Manager who was attending Union/Management negotiating meetings being held concurrently at the plant.

Mr. Edwards introduced the Regulations by circulating Part I Canada Gazette copies to those in attendance and qualified that at present the Regulations had yet to be promulgated Part II.

Mr. Edwards indicated that following promulgation of the Regulations, EPS would notify Giant Mines in writing. The correspondence to Giant would include what was expected of Giant as a result of the Regulations and would also include those major items agreed upon at any meetings.

2. Review of Regulations

Mr. Edwards briefly reviewed the proposed Regulations and associated Socio-Economic Impact Analysis which had been previously forwarded to the Company. It was emphasized that the Emission Standards subsections 4(1)(a), 4(1)(c), and 4(2) apply directly to the Company, while Section 4(1)(b) applies to indirect

SECURITY - CLASSIFICATION - DE SECURITE
OUR FILE/NOTRE REFERENCE 4123-7
YOUR FILE/VOTRE REFERENCE
DATE March 4, 1980

cooling systems such as found at Dickenson Mines Ltd.

It was agreed that the Company's new arsenic trioxide purification plant would be subject to emission standards' subsection 4(1)(c) regarding handling operations. The Company pointed out that existing occupational exposure standards would also have to be met requiring vigorous cleaning of the gas phase, well beyond that required in the Regulations.

3. Malfunction or Breakdown Report

It was agreed that the Company would design a malfunction/breakdown report of a type similar to Form 2 in the Regulations and would begin submitting them to EPS on a routine monthly basis once the Regulations are promulgated. It was understood that for the present all malfunctions or breakdowns in the baghouse would be reported including the number and location of bags replaced each month. There was no explicit explanation provided to the Company of exactly what constituted a malfunction or breakdown beyond that inferred by definition.

4. Report on Controls

By copy of this memo Mr. Edwards will forward a baghouse questionnaire to Mr. Connell. It was agreed that the Company will complete the information required in Form 3 of the Regulations along with the baghouse questionnaire and return them to this office following promulgation of the Regulation.

5. Emission Testing

It was agreed that R. Kent will act as liaison advisor to the Company on emission testing procedures prior to the effective date of the Regulation (likely July 1, 1980). This will enable the Company to reach a satisfactory performance standard, as prescribed in the reference method (soon to be published), so that the Company may be permitted to perform its own stack testing in response to our official request. It is anticipated that EPS will request that an official stack emission test be performed at Giant in accordance with the Regulation.

6. Standard Reference Method(s)

By copy of this memorandum clarification is sought from 3M Division APCD on the following items of interest to the Company which may or may not be covered in the Standard Reference Method for Source Testing, yet to be finalized and printed:

6. (Cont'd)

- 1) Are stainless steel impingers acceptable for use?
- 2) What is the accepted particulate filter digestion method?
- 3) What is the accepted analytical technique?
- 4) What are the accepted probe washing solutions?

To permit the Company an early opportunity to complete its commitment to purchase a new stainless-steel lined probe, clarification as to the probe's acceptability for use in place of an existing and undersized glass lined probe was sought directly of 3M Division by telephone, March 3, 1980. The response was affirmative and the new probe would be acceptable providing special precautionary cleaning measures were incorporated when applying the Method .

The foregoing was a brief summary of the major decisions reached at the meeting. By copy of this draft memo to the Company I will entertain any corrections or additions/deletions which they may wish to suggest.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
A. C. EDWARDS

A. Cam Edwards, P. Eng.

cc: H. Veldhuizen
W. Lemmon
W.J. Bryant
R. Kent
K. Morton
L. Connell