

Nun E. G		BGC ENGIN	SCIENCI	ES COMF	NC.	RNAI
Board 1605		840 - 7 Avenue S.W., Calgary, Alberta, Canada. T2P 3G2			PC	I DP
AUG 23 2003	AUG 2 3 2003 Phone (403) 250-5185 Fax (403) 250-5330					
Public Registry					FO	
		PROJECT MEMORANDUM		BS	-	
To:	Nuna	vut Water Board	Fax No.:	(867) 360-6	369 ^{A1}	2000 a 1000 to 2000 E d 2000
Attention:	Ms. [Dionne Filiatrault, P.Eng., Senior	CC: Carl	(867) 975-4	286 A2	PRINCIPLE ENTERED
Tech		nical Advisor	McLean	. ,	ED	odrena utururan kecapa laye
From:	Holg	er Hartmaler, P.Eng (Ext. 113)	Date:	August 27	2003	
Subject:	NWB1POL0311- Dock Plan and Section Drawings				EXT.	

No. of Pages (including this page):3 Pages Project No: 0308-001-05

With respect to the drawings for the dock decommissioning at Polaris, prepared by Westman Consulting Engineers and submitted to the Nunavut Water Board (NWB) by Teck Cominco, as per the water licence requirements. I would like to offer the following comments:

Westmar Drawing No. 02-101, "Plan and Sections"

- The locations of the Canadian Hydrographic Service (CHS) benchmarks 1, 2 and 3 should be shown on the plan.
- It would appear that these benchmarks are located on structures that may be removed during decommissioning. Will these points still be in place during the dock decommissioning? If not, what survey control will be used to define the extent of the 17.5H:1V slope with respect to the Higher High Water Level (HHWL).
- Why was the conversion from Chart Datum (CD) to Plant Datum (PD) changed in May. 2003? Note that in Appendix C of the Westmar report contained in Vol. 2 of the Polaris Mine Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan (March 2001), the PD is 2.3 m above CD. based on measurements taken by Cominco surveyors on the same three CHS benchmarks, and the report further states that the present PD (in 2001) is 1.37 m above the original PD (pre- 1981).
- . In Note 1, the elevation of Plant Datum above Chart Datum is calculated as the average difference between the elevations of the benchmarks in terms of CD and PD. The differences range from 1.774 m to 2.06 m, a range of 0.29 m. For a slope at 17.5H :1V, the final crest location may differ from the design location by as much as 5 m.
- It is critical that the final beach slopes conform to the actual LLWL and HHWL levels, despite any datum conversions.

This communication is intended for the use of the above named recipient. Any unauthorized use, copying, review or disclosure of the contents by other than the reciplent is prohibited.

BGC Project Memorandum
To: Dionne Filiatrault From: Holger Hartmaier
Subject: NWBPOL0311- Dock Plan and Section Drawings

Date: August 27, 2003 Proj. No: 0308-001-05

Westmar Drawing No. 02-102, "Sections" (1700N to 1350 N)

- Comments regarding the notes for Drawing 02-101 also apply to this drawing.
- Section 1400 N has been modified from the original section shown in the Westmar Report (2001), contained in Vol.2 of the Polaris Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan. (Westmar Drawing 00282-00-103, Sections Sheet 2, dated Oct.24, 2000). The original intent was to slope the beach at 17.5H :1V from the front face of the sheet piles to the HHWL. As shown in Drawing 02-102, there is a 10H :1V slope from the front face of the piles up to LLWL, then the slope flattens to 17.5H :1V above LLWL. It is not clear why this section was modified from the original plan.
- Section 1350 N also goes through the sheet pile cells, but shows a constant 17.5:1 slope.
- There are no notes indicating the precautions to be taken to avoid sedimentation (i.e. silt curtains and berms) during decommissioning.
- The need for removal of the freezing pipes is not indicated on any of the drawings, or sections where they may be found. Note that according to the joint NWB/INAC approval for the dock and marine foreshore issued July 4, 2003, Teck Cominco must establish a protocol for dealing with the removal and disposal of refrigerant contaminated materials, which must be submitted to NWB and INAC at least 60 days before commencement of excavation.

Westmar Drawing 02-103, "Sections" - (1300N-800N)

- Comments regarding the notes for Drawing 02-101 also apply to this drawing.
- Sections 800N and 900N are located on either end of the temporary dock, however
 there are no details showing the actual decommissioning of the temporary dock. The
 decommissioning plan called for cutting off the steel piles at "ground level". Teck
 Cominco should clarify the depth with respect to the LLWL. Preferably, the piles should
 be cut off at the LLWL level since going deeper will involve creating excessive
 sedimentation and disturbance to the marine environment.

General Comments

- No specifications were included with the drawings. The specifications should provide
 details on the decommissioning that are in accordance with the approved
 Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan and the NWB/INAC joint approval issued July
 4, 2003, with particular reference to the DFO mitigation requirements to protect fish
 habitat.
- As part of the shoreline decommissioning and regrading, existing rip rap will be removed. The decommissioned beach is expected to have a median grain size of 10 mm, similar to the adjacent natural beaches. What will Teck Cominco be doing with the larger rip rap sized boulders in order to maintain the 10mm median grain size criterion?

08/28/2003 10:35 403-250-5330 PAGE 03/03

BGC Project Memorandum

To: Dionne Filiatrault From: Holger Hartmaier Date: August 27, 2003
Subject: NWBPOL0311- Dock Plan and Section Drawings Proj. No: 0308-001-05

Closure

We trust that this memorandum meets with your requirements at this time. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly

Per BGC Engineering Inc.

Maturace

Holger Hartmaier, M.Eng., P.Eng.

Senior Geotechnical Engineer