

From: [Mark Balog](#)
To: [Phyllis Beaulieu](#)
Subject: FW: reasoning
Date: Wednesday, May 12, 2010 3:20:45 PM

From: Mark Balog
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2010 2:47 PM
To: Lou-Ann Cornacchio; Tanya Trenholm
Cc: 'bernie.macisaac@inac.gc.ca'; Phyllis Beaulieu <licensing@nunavutwaterboard.org>; John Witteman; 'dionne@nunavutwaterboard.org'
Subject: reasoning

Hi Lou-Ann,

I understand that you just talked with John Witteman from our office about the security deposit that INAC is seeking on our project. He has relayed to me that your decision was not to accept our framework or explanation for resolving this matter – the consequence of which is that our three amendments to the Water Board continue to be delayed.

Since Tanya's letter (dated May 6, 2010) and the NWB letter from Phyllis (dated May 10, 2010) both, in our opinion, provide two options, one of which clearly asks for information on how Comaplex intends to achieve compliance, and we have provided that framework, and been denied, I must ask for the reason for your "no" decision. No explanation was given to John and I need to explain this to our President.

On a related item, you also told John that we were in error in approaching INAC about an amendment of the security bond amount and that we should go to the NWB. However, the bond security amount was estimated by INAC (Ian Rumbolt) in a letter dated May 11, 2009. This is the reason we thought INAC should consider the changes. Sounds like a routing issue, so we will also talk with the NWB on this matter, although they were also sent copies of the letter requesting the changes.

We look forward to your reply.

mark