

NUNAVUT WATER BOARD
Public Hearing
Iqaluit Municipal Water License Renewal
November 23, 2000

Chairperson: Thomas Kudloo

[TK = Thomas Kudloo
ST = Steve Trainor
PS = Paul Smith
BT = Bill Tilleman

AW = Anne Wilson
BH = Bob Hanson
MH = Matthew Hough
SP = Unidentified Speaker]

JT = John Tidball
JG = Jordan DeGroot
DF = Dionne Filiatrault

[Start of Tape 4 - Side A]

AW: ... the plant is expected to be operational in early 2001. The departments jointly recommend transition to the new plant be no later than September 1, 2001. I know the municipality hopes to have it commissioned by spring. That gives a little bit of leeway, but we do encourage a date to be included that is something to work towards. If unavoidable delayed, monthly progress reports could begin in September. The type of reports we have in mind would outline problems, activities, progress, remaining work, and revisions to the target date, just so that all involved will know what the situation is.

And the options for sludge management should be identified, and a plan submitted for approval. The... I'd like to encourage the municipality to provide a short-term plan for their pilot scale, as they called it, and on the long-term plan we'll have to know such things as composition, other storage alternatives, the time needed to compost, if that's the route they go, the possibility of incineration if the new system would accommodate that, and possible end uses of the composted materials.

I'd like to commend the town on the progress made with the Solid Waste Management Planning Study, and we're asking that submission of a final proposal for the new solid waste facility be given within three months of the license issuance. And the reason for that is simply to have the definitive option identified, although from today's discussions it's fairly clear which one that's going to be. We also ask that a contingency plan be submitted for the solid waste disposal, during any interim period, between facilities, if it comes to that. And we would like the opportunity to comment on such a plan. We also ask that an A&R plan for the existing dump be developed as well.

And going to hazardous waste, it's recommended that the town submit a plan for the management of hazardous wastes. Such a plan should include characterisation of the

waste stream, and this goes to what Mr. Webber was saying, you have to know what is in your site when it comes to abandonment, for one thing. There should be provision for secure storage at the dump at the site, and identification of handling and final disposal methods.

And it's my impression that management of hazardous waste is not currently very formal. I think further planning is needed, and while this often has to be an at-source initiative by the generators, there's a lot the municipality can do to bring this forward. I'm just thinking of the things that the Yellowknife city has done that have helped, and they would include things like a waste oil collecting tank, a separate area for battery recycling, the acids are neutralised and the rest is shipped out. It's very important to have secure storage for waste solvents so they're not tipping over and causing clean-up problems, and things like household hazardous waste days, and education of the people who are generating the wastes. And I'm sure there are lots more ideas that can come out.

I'd strongly like to encourage that, and the concern I have is that if it isn't convenient to manage hazardous waste, it can either be directly disposed into the environment by irresponsible people who just don't know what else to do with it, or put into the mainstream of municipal waste where it subsequently can leach out from the landfill and enter into surface waters that way, as well. I do feel this is an area of jurisdiction for the Water Board, and would like to see some further action on that.

Okay, with respect to operation and maintenance, the most recent plan approved by the Water Board was in 1995, and the departments recommend that a revised operation and maintenance plan be submitted following issuance of this renewal license. It does sound like the municipality internally has one operating, so hopefully that wouldn't be a hardship. And there is one operational concern that was identified at the sewage lagoon. That is the measurement of the lagoon freeboard. The proper installation of a gauge is needed so that these concerns, with measurement of the level of the lagoon, can be known.

For spill contingency planning, I don't believe there is currently a plan in place, and the departments recommend that the license conditions include the requirement for a revised plan to be submitted for approval within three months, and we ask that annual updates for this plan should be required under the license.

There's a few abandonment and restoration issues. The existing sewage lagoon requires a practical closure plan that should be developed within six months, and implementation on approval. The plan should consider interim remediation measures, such as supernating(?) treatment, run-off quality and sludge management, its potential

use as a back-up facility, long-term dyke stability - and this may be a question of the drying up of the dykes during de-watering - and ways to reduce the lagoon footprint.

And I realise that the final abandonment and restoration plan can't be developed as long as they retain the old system for back-up use. There should be an interim plan, include things like dyke stability, the timing of dyke inspections, and also, perhaps, look at the final configuration. Is the full lagoon, as it sits now, needed for the back-up, or can part of it be remediated? Just things that can be looked at.

We seem to all be in agreement that final abandonment and restoration plans are needed for the old landfill sites, and the appropriate A&R plans with implementation schedules should be submitted by specific dates under the new water license.

With respect to the surveillance network program, we're asking that field measurements be included at the time of taking samples. We'd like to see parameters such as the field pH, sample temperature, and the ambient wind and weather conditions recorded and reported with the results.

We find that the parameters and frequencies as specified in the previous and 1999 water license are acceptable, and I would just like to add with respect to the bio-assay requirements under that license that Environment Canada is available to assist with the bio-assay testing, if we can... we'd be happy to handle the samples for the municipality.

A quality assurance / quality control plan should be submitted under the SMP. We're asking for this within three months of the license issuance. I didn't have a copy of one that had ever been approved, so that would be good to see.

And the requested license term of five years is acceptable. The reason we agreed on this was that five years will bridge the commissioning of two major new facilities and provide a bit of a track record on their effectiveness. And during that time period I would expect that new operational needs will be identified, and that will give enough of a time-frame to know those things.

With that, I would like to thank the Board for the opportunity, on behalf of the federal departments, for letting us participate in the development of a practical and environmentally-responsible renewal license, and at this time we'd be happy to answer any questions which the Board, proponent or audience may have.

TK: Thank-you. Are there any questions from the applicant to Environment Canada?

JT: Mr. Chairman, yes, we'll have a few questions. Just give me one second, here.

TK: Would you please remember to state your name?

JT: Thank-you. It's John Tidball for the municipality of Iqaluit. Ms Wilson, I just want to go through, more or less in the order that you went through. I've got to get myself organised, here.

Ms Wilson, you were here for the presentation this morning, I think. Were you? A condition was suggested by the municipality of Iqaluit with regard to a report on long-term water supply options, and the suggestion was simply that a report be submitted by the end of next year. And I believe what Mr. Hough said was that the municipality would be happy to include things like a hydrological assessment of Lake Geraldine, and those kinds of things. Are you satisfied with what was proposed this morning? I just want to make... I'm trying to understand whether we're all on the same page or not.

AW: Anne Wilson speaking. What I'll have to do with some of these questions is just gain agreement in a minute or less with my colleagues, and then answer, if that's okay.

ST: Steven Trainor, DIAND. Can I just quickly ask... I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, it's been a long week for us. I would just like to ask for clarification from Mr. Tidball of exactly what section or what issue he means from his presentation this morning, so that we don't sort of waste anyone's time, we can get directly to the answer he seeks.

TK: Thank-you.

JT: Mr. Chairman. I'm on page 5 of your written submission. I don't know where it fits on the overheads, under Water Source and Anticipated Volumes, and you've got a recommendation for including in this study of a study as water license condition, and recommend that it includes certain things. All I'm trying to make sure, Mr. Trainor, is that we're all in agreement, so that the Board doesn't go away thinking that there is some disagreement as between the applicant and the federal party.

AW: Mr. Chairman, Anne Wilson. I'd like to just specify that the long-term water supply study is a separate point from the Lake Geraldine dam and the inspections that we're requesting there. Otherwise we're in agreement that what the municipality proposes is what we are asking for.

JT: Thank-you. I was then going to turn to the Lake Geraldine dam issue. I'm wondering, Ms Wilson, or any of the other members of this panel, if you could perhaps enlighten us as to the concerns that you have with the integrity of the dam. You heard Mr. Hough, this morning, say that from the municipality's point of view, they think it's regularly inspected, that they get advice from their engineers, and as far as they're concerned they don't think there's anything wrong with it. And they're wondering - I guess, we're wondering - what the basis for the concern is. If you could enlighten us on that.

ST: Steven Trainor, DIAND. I guess our main concern is ensuring the integrity of the structure. We do recognise that it's important to have a qualified engineer, either on staff or some third party, to certainly look at and monitor, on occasion, at least once, to have some official point of reference that says the dam is structurally sound, and given the issues that were done in 1997, as in our submission, we did have some concerns about it. We do, however, clarify in our submission on page 5 that if there is some recent work to that effect that has been done, that the Board would accept, then we would be comfortable looking at it and accepting it also, if that is sufficient.

At the same time, we would like to raise a question, since it has been brought up by Mr. Tidball, regarding... he seems to be trying to provide us with some comfort level regarding the monitoring. We do have some issue with regard to that, and I would like to then pass over to Lee Webber if he would describe, briefly, what that issue is, as Mr. Tidball has mentioned and continually mentions the issue of monitoring and their confidence in it.

LW: What Mr. - Lee Webber, Justice Canada - what Mr. Trainor is alluding to is general concern on the part of DIAND, and I think this concern is shared by the other federal government departments represented here today, that confidence be built in the town's performance, and that the Board and all the other interested parties be given reason to have confidence. We can't be confidence, we can't be sure, that suddenly we're going to a new era when we can take at face value the town's assurances that certain things will be done. We want to have a practical way of checking on that performance. We want benchmarks established. If the need arises, if circumstances are such that the town finds, for good and sufficient reason it is unable to meet some deadline, for example, then the town has open to it the option of applying for amendment to the license.

Coming back to, specifically, to the question of the dam inspection, again, it's a matter, as Mr. Trainor has said, of establishing a benchmark, a benchmark established by a qualified engineer, something that will give the Board and all concerned reason to have confidence in the state of affairs, and subsequently in the town's performance.

TK: There was a gentleman, Mr. Chris Nichols raised his hand. You've got a question or comment to make?

BH?: Excuse me, if you wouldn't mind waiting until the end, 'til the interveners.. ? Thank-you.

TK: Okay. Thank-you. Okay. Are you done? Mr. Tidball.

JT: Thank-you, Mr. Chairman. Can I just follow-up on that? I guess the difficulty we're having, over here, and I'll be completely blunt about it, the municipality is unaware of

any problems with the dam, and in going back to the transcript from last year, and perhaps the municipality erred in not pursuing this matter further last year, we can't, for the life of us, determine why it is that the federal departments are worried about it, because from the municipality's point of view, there doesn't seem to be anything wrong with the dam. And I guess the question I'd like to ask is whether there's any information that any of you ladies or gentlemen have that could be provided to the municipality to indicate that there's any problem with the dam.

ST: Steven Trainor, DIAND, Mr. Chair. I guess our standpoint is, if we can take the opposite view, is that we have not been provided with the evidence from the municipality itself that says why they are so confident, and that's what we are looking for, and that's why we have, in our statement, here, if they can supply it, that they have in recent past, then certainly we would accept that. We are just looking for that evidence somewhere, in the last couple of years.

JG: I'd like to follow that up. Jordan DeGroot, here. Our department takes a precautionary approach. That means that even if we don't have adequate information, we err on the side of safety, to make sure that the inspection is done, and so we would prefer that the geotechnical inspection be performed.

TK: Thank-you.

BH: Mr. Chair, may I? It's Mr. Hanson, here. The people that read the transcript last year had to figure out who spoke. You mentioned that, Mr. Tidball, at the very beginning of this hearing. Every time anybody speaks, please state for name first. When we're going back and forth, it's so easy to start the conversation. Go through the Chair. The people who read the transcripts have to know who you are. We don't want to keep reminding you. Please state your name.

TK: Thank-you.

JT: It's John Tidball. May I ask one further question on this, and we'll move on. Am I correct, then, that the position of the federal departments is that if you can be provided with whatever there is by way of inspection reports that Mr. Hough referred to today, that you might well be satisfied, and that you might then say that there is no requirement for geotechnical inspection?

ST: Steven Trainor, Mr. Chair. First of all, I will say it is difficult to say completely yes, in the fact that we haven't seen them, and do not know the nature of them, whether they are internal documents done by whether it's the utilidor crew, as suggested, or whether it is an official, as outlined in our intervention, some geotechnical engineer under some standard. And will reiterate that yes, we could possibly consider those, as we've stated in

our intervention, if the recent work is done and supplied to us and we feel there is a significant comfort level in the credibility level of it, then yes we could probably consider it, but we'd have to see it on a case-by-case basis to meet those requirements as set out in our intervention.

JT: Thank-you, Mr. Chair. It's John Tidball. The sewage lagoons, for a moment - and I'm afraid we're going to have the same question, almost - having heard - Ms Wilson, you gave the evidence just now - having heard Mr. Hough this morning, and seen his description of the problem that occurred in 1997, and also his description of the way the dam had been rebuilt, again, I wonder if you could help us with exactly why you think a geotechnical inspection of the dykes ought to be done now, as opposed to, I think as he suggested, later on, once the lagoon is emptied, and a plan has to be developed for its use as a contingency facility.

LW: ...Justice Canada. I just wanted to insert a point of information at this stage. I don't want to take the town by surprise. This morning we had the site visit. One of the places that the bus did not go was the sewage lagoon. However, Mr. Smith took it upon himself to have a look-see at the sewage lagoon, and my thinking was that once we'd had the questions on the intervention I would get Mr. Smith to describe what he had seen at the sewage lagoon.

Now, I think this has a bearing on Mr. Tidball's question, but I don't want to ambush Mr. Tidball, and I want to give the town fair opportunity to reply to what Mr. Smith will have to say. So, what I'm wondering is whether perhaps the best way to proceed might be for Mr. Tidball to leave until later his questions about the sewage lagoon, as the other questions that he has about the intervention, and then have Mr. Smith describe what it was he observed, and then the town could pose its questions about the sewage lagoon. Alternatively, I could have Mr. Smith speak to his observations right now.

JT: I'm happy to take Mr. Webber's suggestion, Mr. Chairman. It's John Tidball.

TK: Thank-you.

LW: So, would you...

[End of Tape 4 - Side A]

[Start of Tape 4 - Side B]

BH?: ...sewage lagoon. When we did go into the sewage treatment plant, when you walked back out the door and you looked east, you looked exactly into the sewage lagoon. It was only from here to the wall away from us. Perhaps nobody really noticed. The wind was not blowing in our faces. But we were extremely close to it, and that was probably a

mistake on our part that we did not take a look at what was coming out, and where it was coming out. Thank-you for bringing that up, Mr. Webber.

LW: Lee Webber, Justice Canada. I'm afraid I don't know the lay of the land as well as the Iqaluit residents do - I'm a Yellowknifer - and so I wasn't aware that the sewage lagoon was right beside us. In any event, Mr. Smith's observations were made at the toe of the lagoon, which I believe would have been at some greater distance from where we stood. Is that correct?

BH: Mr. Chairman, Robert Hanson. Probably from here to the wall, the back wall. It's not very far away. Very close. We just missed it.

LW: Lee Webber. There was certainly no intention on DIAND's part to sneak off and have an observation that nobody else would be able to share.

TK: Thank-you.

JT: Ms Wilson, you repeated something that's on -

BH: Name?

JT: ...page 7 of your written submission. John Tidball. Sorry. You repeated something that's on page 7 of your submissions, and I had the sense that perhaps there was a change in that, and I just want to make sure I understand it. In your written submission you had recommended that the town submit a final proposal for a new waste management facility. I took it from that you said that you may be accepting that that has actually already been done? I'm trying to understand how that fits with what's being proposed now.

AW: Anne Wilson. Is my mike live? Okay, Mr. Chairman, to answer that, the option of the incinerator has not been formally proposed to the Board, to my knowledge, nor the other alternatives for the management of the ash, and so on, so I do request that the plan requested in our intervention be submitted. It doesn't have to be long or elaborate, just identifying definitively the option that the municipality wants to pursue.

JT: Can I put this to you, Ms Wilson. Mr. Hough said this morning, and we've said in the written evidence, that the municipal council of Iqaluit has adopted a plan that would see an incinerator and a new landfill. Is that all you're looking for? Is it a one-line statement in a report that says that's what they're going to do?

AW: Anne Wilson. What I would like to see is a little more detail as to site, timing, horizons that you're looking at as far as, like, a 20-year life span of the incinerator. Just the broad, basic details of it.

JT: Thank-you, Mr. Chairman. It's John Tidball. Perhaps I'll address that in final submissions, then, because I don't think we're going to get any further with the questions.

TK: Mr. Trainor.

ST: Thank-you, Mr. Chair. Steven Trainor. Just an additional point to that. Given the proposal you've said, can the town, with some certainty, guarantee that it has the financing to be able to make those statements and move forward on the statements and provide, once again, the confidence that it will happen?

JT: Can I ask Mr. Hough - it's John Tidball - ask him to speak to that?

MH: Thank-you, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad that Mr. Trainor has posed this question, and as the federal departments are interveners at this point in time, the end of my statement will be actually a question to them.

We operate within our means. We are a very small town. We are a municipality under the governance of our big brother government, the Government of Nunavut, and we depend on them, continuously, for funding. We have no guaranteed funding with respect to this year's budget estimates. Having said that, last year's budget estimates spoke to a portion of money that would get us well on our way to completing this project, and I hope that later, when we hear from... the submission from Community Government and Transportation representative will speak to that at that point in time.

And with that segue, my question to the federal government departments is one based on all your requests of the municipality. Geotechnical investigations of the dam, the lagoon dykes, all of this takes money, it takes time. What we have done with respect to the dam, for instance, is our last inspection was July. It was done by OMM Trault, certified geotechnical engineers. That's who were up there on our behalf. All of this takes money. Do you have any?

LW: Lee Webber, Justice Canada. I would like Mr. Hough whether he's looking for an answer, a serious answer to that question, or was it simply put for rhetorical purposes?

MH: Well, actually, Mr. Chair, outside of this forum, that is actually a very serious question, and I think one may be speaking out of turn, but one I'm sure the Government of Nunavut is putting to the federal government all the time, and one that the municipality of Iqaluit I know is going to be posing to the federal departments. So, this is an issue for outside of this forum, but it is a very serious question.

LW: Lee Webber. I don't want to pre-empt any answer that any of my colleagues here might want to make, but I gather from what Mr. Hough has just responded, that yes, essentially, it is a rhetorical question, and that he doesn't expect federal government officials here today to start drafting budgets or writing cheques.

TK: Mr. Trainor.

ST: Steven Trainor, Mr. Chairman. Thank-you. My point in making that question is not to bring to light the financial issue, and as Mr. Webber correctly pointed out, we don't want to deal with that. My point is to get at, and to assist the Board in establishing what are realistic time-frames and realistic expectations with which we can make a license. That is what I'm trying to do. So, in our intervention, when we've asked for something, it is based on the knowledge we know, and what can we realistically do at this time, not what the potential are - that is always good and we want to look at it - and that's our intervention is based. So, even though we ask for things like a geotechnical inspection of the Geraldine dam, we do provide an opportunity that should you show the Board that you have done this in the recent time, please bring it forward so that it's knowledgeable and it's made aware. That is our goal, here, is to help provide a realistic framework from which the Board can make its assessment.

TK: Thank-you.

JT: Just a few more questions, Mr. Chairman. It's John Tidball. Ms Wilson, I suspect that me may disagree on the hazardous waste issue. I'm wondering if you could help me a little bit with trying to understand what your recommendation is. When you talk about the municipality developing a plan for hazardous waste, are you talking about a plan for hazardous waste that would be generated by the municipality itself, or are you talking about a plan for hazardous waste being generated by others, over which the municipality has, perhaps, limited control? And if it's the latter, can you explain how you think that kind of a plan could be implemented?

AW: Anne Wilson. The type of plan that I would like to see required by the water license is something that the municipality would develop to provide the wherewithal to those people who were generating the hazardous wastes to responsibly manage them. I do believe that is the responsibility of the municipality, because certainly the clean-up for not doing that will fall upon the municipality eventually.

All I can offer in support of that Environment Canada has programs under the Millennium Eco-action program, in sustainable communities, that can provide matching support. So, if community vehicles... like, I understand there is NECC - and I don't know what that stands for - community group that is interested in these types of issues, that funds could be raised to match theirs, and their in-kind efforts.

I don't know if that answers your question. Maybe I'll just see...

JT: Let me try it one other way. I think we're part-way there. I think the question is are you looking for the municipality to create disposal options, or management options, for private individuals? Is that the point? So that the municipality, for example, makes a -

household hazardous waste is a good example - once every so often makes a household hazardous waste facility available so that anybody with old paint can bring it. Is it that kind of thing, where it's purely voluntary on the part of non-governmental agencies?

AW: Anne Wilson. That would be a good start. If the municipality was able to provide the framework, a secure storage area at the landfill site, a tank for waste oil to go into. I don't know that you would restrict it to just the household generators, because it's... wherever it's being generated, the important thing is to prevent it from entering the environment. Just to make sure the options are available, and if there's a user pay, that would address the commercial generators. Just so that all is managed and that you're not going to have the wastes dumped or entering the municipal stream.

JT: One more question on that, Mr. Chairman. It's John Tidball. Ms Wilson, is it possible for you to tell us why you think that that's a municipal responsibility, as opposed to the responsibility of any other level of government?

AW: Anne Wilson. I think it's fairly clear that the residents of a municipality are the source of the wastes that we're talking about right now, and that the problem will become the municipality's if it is not managed. And so that's a fairly basic answer that addresses it.

JT: Mr. Chairman, can I just ask a question? I think it's Ms Wilson, but it may be someone else on the panel. There's been a lot of discussion about closure and then use as a contingency facility of the existing sewage lagoon. You make certain recommendations on page 8 of your written submissions, and I'm just wondering whether you have any comment on the proposal that the municipality made by way of a condition this morning, which is I think along the lines of what you have in mind, and I just want to make sure it sort of tracks your suggestion, so that we're all talking about the same thing again.

I'm referring to the one where it was suggested that the municipality submit, within six months, a plan for the conversion of the lagoon to a back-up facility, and that the plan in also to address long-term maintenance and inspection. Does that fit with what your recommendation is?

AW: Anne Wilson. No, we are fine with that. Thanks.

JT: It's John Tidball again. The last couple of questions have to do with the Surveillance Network Program, and your recommendations on page 9 of your written submission. There is... first of all, there is the suggestion that certain things be done at the time of sampling. I'm wondering if you could help us with the rationale for that?

AW: Anne Wilson. It will often help in the interpretation of the results that come back from the lab. Often the pH will change between the field sampling and the lab sampling, so it's much better to know what it is at the time the sample was taken. It gives a better

picture of the effluent quality. Certain parameters, such as ammonia, are non-toxic at lower pHs and toxic at higher, so that helps us to know that. Also, if you have a wind direction that is bringing... not so much in this case... I was just thinking often you will get mixing from local waters if the wind is blowing... there's a pile-up on land, of the waters, that may be mixing in with your samples. I don't think that's probably the case where we'd sample end-of-pipe here. It's just a tool to help better interpret the data when we get them back from the lab.

JT: Thank-you, Mr. Chairman. It's John Tidball again. Those are my questions.

LW: Lee Webber, Mr. Chairman. What I'd like to do at this point, in the panel is agreeable, is to follow up on what I was talking about a little bit earlier. I'd like to pose a couple of questions to Mr. Smith, about observations that he made earlier today. And then perhaps Mr. Tidball will have follow-up questions of his own.

TK: Please proceed.

LW: Lee Webber. First of all, Mr. Smith, could I ask you to explain... to identify your current position with DIAND, and also your background with respect to water inspection?

PS: Paul Smith. Mr. Chairman, currently I hold the position of Manager of Water Resources for the Department of Northern Affairs for the Nunavut region. My background is that for... from 1992 until 1999 I was a Water Resources Officer.

LW: Lee Webber. And as a Water Resources Officer, did your duties include inspections pursuant to water licenses?

PS: Paul Smith. Yes, that is correct.

LW: Lee Webber. Mr. Smith, following the completion of the group tour this morning, did you, yourself, go to observe a further site, and if so, which site?

PS: Paul Smith. Yes, that is correct. I and Philip Lavalie(?), the Current Water Resources Officer, made a trip out to the west dyke of the sewage treatment... the lagoon, at about five minutes to noon.

LW: Lee Webber. Mr. Smith, could you describe what you observed there, and also identify any conclusions or concerns that you drew or that arose as a result of your observations?

PS: Paul Smith. Following the presentation that the municipality of Iqaluit made this morning, pertaining to maintaining a clear section below the toe of the dam, with that in mind what we observed, or what I observed, was that there was snow completely covering the downslope of that dam, and that it would be impossible to be able to monitor what seepage could be coming through that dam.

LW: Lee Webber. Any further observations, any further concerns arising from the observations, and for that matter, and further thoughts as to the relationship between what you observed and the explanation that Mr. Hough gave this morning?

PS: Paul Smith. I suppose it then relates back to the ability of the town to provide assurance to the regulators that their monitoring program, and their arguments for not requiring a formal inspection... they don't match to what would appear, because of the snow still being there, that they mesh.

LW: Thank-you, Mr. Smith. I'll turn it over to Mr. Tidball. It's Lee Webber speaking.

JT: It's John Tidball. It strikes me that the easiest way to do this, with the Board's indulgence, is just ask Mr. Hough to speak to it. We're hearing this for the first time, and he tells me he has... he's prepared to speak to it, and with your permission I'd like him to do that.

MH: Thank-you, Mr. Chairman. Fair enough. The... I myself wasn't over at the lagoon today. I will be there shortly hereafter the hearing to have a look at the snow and ice build-up. The maintenance program calls for us to keep it clear, it does, and if there's one thing I can say very quickly is that I'll have it clear tomorrow if it is banked up as you say it is. That's part of our maintenance program, that's what we do, that's what we're meant to do.

With respect to everyday occurrences of this type, we have staff who are charged with the responsibility of monitoring these sorts of situations. No question. But if any time, anyone, any regulating agency, spots any of these issues, my door is always open to hear them and to something about them. And I hope that a number of the other regulatory agencies do note that since... and the mayor spoke to a new administration, a new council. We have that, now, and we're working to try and satisfy everybody's needs. There are a lot of needs in this town. One of them is the maintenance of that sewage lagoon. No question. Point taken. It'll be taken care tomorrow.

TK: Any further comments? Mr. Webber?

LW: Lee Webber. I'd just like to point out that I interrupted Mr. Tidball in the line of questioning that he was about to embark upon earlier when he was posing questions apropos of the intervention, so I'd just like to ask Mr. Tidball... to make sure that Mr. Tidball doesn't have any further questions relating to the Government of Canada department's position with respect to the sewage lagoon.

JT: [inaudible]

TK: Thank-you. Okay, we've been keeping our translators going for two hours. Can we please take 15 minutes for their sake, and we'll get back to the subject? Thank-you.

[break]

TK: ...shall proceed. Mr. Lee Webber?

LW: Lee Webber. There was... first of all, my questions to Mr. Smith were the only additional evidence that I had in mind, or that we collectively had in mind to present. Looking for Mr. Tilleman, he had raised a question during the break about entering a particular document as an exhibit. I was hoping he could explain that.

TK: Go ahead, Dionne.

DF: Dionne Filiatrault _____ Mr. Tilleman was hoping that the actual dam safety guidelines for 1999 would be submitted as an exhibit so that we can consider them... or, the Board can consider them in their deliberations.

TK: Thank-you, Dionne.

LW: Lee Webber. We don't have an objection to doing that. Unfortunately we don't have a copy with us here. But you do! So, perhaps you could enter that as an exhibit.

BT?: Okay, Mr. Chairman. I will do that right now. What else did I agree to do that I don't know about? [laughter]

[End of Tape 4]