

# Record of Conversation

Date: April 26, 2006		
NWB License IBR-MAC	Project: Mackar Inlet, CAM-5	

Attendees: Phyllis Beaulieu (NWB), Eva Schulz (UMA), Phil Warren (DCC), Amy Dumoulin-Jeromel (ESG), Barry Kulabek (UMA)	Organization: DCC, UMA, ESG
Recorded by: Sarah Gagné	Phone/Fax: NWB Boardroom & Sarah on the phone

Re: Information request from NWB

There has been correspondence between the NWB and the Applicant (DCC and administrator UMA) the past couple of months regarding further information required for the applicant for the remediation of the CAM-5 DEWLine, Mackar Inlet

During the meeting the following was discussed regarding the outstanding points/issues that correspond to the letter sent by the NWB on March 14.

## **1. Drawings stamped by an Engineer are required for the sewage lagoons and the incinerator.**

I began the conversation by asking if the incinerator that was going to be provided by the contractor was a pre-fabricated piece of equipment or a burn barrel. The NWB wanted to ensure that the Applicant was not going to be open burning.

Eva said that they had spoken to Colette Spanguolo with Environment Canada (EC) in Iqaluit this week regarding incineration and sewage treatment. Colette said that Environment Canada would require that there was complete combustion of the wastes that plastics etc were not being put in the incinerator. NWB agreed with EC and said NWB would follow EC's requirements.

UMA added that they don't have requirements for performance of the incinerator in the contractor specifications but the camp incinerator is required to be forced air and complete combustion of the wastes.

Regarding the sewage lagoon, UMA also spoke to Environment Canada regarding the sewage lagoon and EC did not require a liner for the sewage lagoon if only camp wastewater (grey and black) were treated in the sewage lagoon. NWB agrees that a liner may not be required for camp sewage lagoon.

There was discussion about how the sewage lagoon location is designed and the site selected. The process is the contractor selects a site for the camp and then sites the sewage lagoon. The contract specifications have general siting requirements (ex. 450 m from waterbodies etc. as outlined in the application). Then the contractor proposes a location and designs the lagoon. The site engineer approves the location and design. The contractor cannot build the lagoon without approval from the site engineer.

The current process for designing and construction of the lagoon is based on field engineering decisions and it is not anticipated that the contractor has an engineer on staff who could provide the Board a signed and stamped drawing for the sewage lagoons.

**Action for point 1**

Incineration: Applicant to provide the NWB criteria in specifications for the incinerator.

Sewage Lagoons: NWB to check requirement for stamped sewage lagoon.

**2. No discussion, information already provided by Applicant.****3. Further detail on incinerator.**

See point 1

**4. Mapping of site infrastructure.**

Applicant cannot provide any further information at this time as the location of the site infrastructure is the responsibility of the Contractor. There has been a letter of intent signed with the Contractor and the contract should be awarded in the next month to six weeks. There was no real consensus reached on this issue as the NWB still requires this information. Eva said that GPS coordinates of all waste disposal facilities are currently required in other licences. NWB agreed, however the NWB is looking more to how the different infrastructure may impact each other and the receiving waters.

**Action for point 4**

NWB to provide further clarification to Applicant.

**5. No discussion, information already provided by Applicant.****6. Provision of a Wastewater Management Plan**

Eva stated that this information is available and had been provided to the NWB in the past, however past technical advisors had told the Applicant that this information is not required.

**Action for point 6**

UMA to provide a wastewater management plan or equivalent to the NWB.

**7. Landfarm**

The NWB requires a supplementary questionnaire be filled out for landfarms. Barry with UMA is also working with INAC on an intermediate DEWLine site, FOX-C. UMA provided information for INAC regarding a landfarm at FOX-C and they wondered if that information was sufficient.

**Action for point 7**

NWB to review information submitted for FOX-C and respond to UMA.

**8. Spill Contingency Planning**

The NWB requires spill contingency plans are submitted in accordance with NWB guidelines. The spill plan submitted by the Applicant is generic and does not provide the site specific information required. The Contractor will be required to submit a site specific spill plan. There was discussion as to when the Contractor spill plan would be available to submit to the Board. Because of project logistics, it was requested by the Applicant that the site specific spill plan be submitted 60 days prior to the commencement of earthworks.

**9. Monitoring**

The primary concern for monitoring is the wastewater that should be covered in point 6. In the past a long term monitoring plan for the landfills was required as part of the licence application. The NWB agreed that the long-term monitoring is required under the licence but that it may be submitted after the completion of the works and this requirement will be included as a term and condition in the licence. For an example of a DEWLine long term program the NWB is referred to PIN-3, Lady Franklin Point.

**Action for point 9**

The Applicant will submit an operational monitoring program that includes the requirement in point 6. The long-term monitoring program will be submitted during the term of the licence and will be included as a term and condition in the licence.

There was also some general conversation after going through the points in the letter. It was decided that the outstanding issues would be resolved for Mackar Inlet before proceeding to the application for CAM-1 Jenny Lind because there will be similar issues. Also, it was requested by DCC that any correspondence or “red flags” that may be raised by the NWB for the long-term monitoring projects be directed solely to the Licensee and the administrator of the licence. Phyllis confirmed that any correspondence is sent solely to the Licensee and/or the administrator of the licence for every NWB licence.

Sarah Gagné  
Technical Advisor