

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

Chairperson: Thomas Kudloo

[TK = Thomas Kudloo

JT = John Tidball

MM = Marcel Mason

SP = Unidentified Speaker]

RE = Robert Eno

DF = Dionne Filiatrault

BT = Bill Tilleman

CN = Chris Nichols

SH = Susan Hardy

WM = William Mackenzie

[Start of Tape 6 - Side A]

RE: ...to office buildings. There's office buildings popping up all over town. Every one of those office buildings has a pipe going in, and a pipe going out, and every one of those office buildings produces garbage, and all of these people that have come into town produce waste. It seems like nobody has thought about this, or at least nobody gave it any serious thought. There's a lot of money around for buildings and such, but there doesn't seem to be any money around for sewage and solid waste management.

I believe that it's time to start focusing on, as I said in my submission, the more mundane and sometimes odious matters relating to the operation of a community, and that is the proper management of water, sewage and solid waste. And I believe it is incumbent upon all levels of government to take these issues into serious consideration, and allocate resources accordingly.

And finally, just so I'm not the big heavy, I do take heart, in looking at the new council, the mayor and the council, many of whom I've known for many years, and whose integrity, in my opinion, are beyond question. I've also had success in working with some of the senior municipal officials. They seem cooperative, seem to want to do the right thing, and I don't think I'm going to have a problem working with them, and I hope that we can all work together and try and resolve these issues.

And that concludes my submission. Thank-you.

TK: Thank-you, Mr. Eno.

CN: Chris Nichols, Department of Sustainable Development. I don't have anything to add to Rob's intervention. Thanks.

TK: Thank-you, Mr. Nichols. Are there any questions from the applicant?

JT: Mr. Chairman, it's John Tidball. Just actually one question, but before I get to the question I want to preface something and respond to something Mr. Eno said. To the extent, this morning, I was talking about jurisdiction, I may have lumped him in with others, and I... and I probably shouldn't have done that. Respectfully, I think the way Mr. Eno has put it is the way I would put it, that a lot of what he's suggested are very good suggestions, and the municipality takes the suggestions very seriously, and many of them, as Mr. Hough has said, they're looking into. The narrower issue that I was speaking to was whether or not the Board has any power to get into regulating them, and he and I may disagree on that, but I certainly appreciate the suggestions, and the municipality does, as well.

The one question I had for Mr. Eno has to do with the pilot project for composting sewage sludge, and I'm just trying to understand how that would happen, in your mind, Mr. Eno. As I understand it, what will happen is the new plant, God willing, will open next spring, let's say, and fairly soon thereafter will start producing sludge, at which point something has to be done with it. How... and I took your point to be that you thought a pilot project should happen some time before that. I'm just wondering how you think that should happen, given that sludge won't be produced until after the plant is operating.

RE: Robert Eno, speaking, Sustainable Development. Without getting too prescriptive, because your situation is unique, if that were me, if I were the person in charge of this operation, I'd go to the lagoon - or send one of my workers [laughter] - I would scoop out several bucket loads - I don't mean heavy equipment bucket loads - but I would out some bucket loads of sludge. I would contract out an engineering firm that specialises in this sort of thing, and I would have them conduct pilot-scale projects in the lab.

I'll give you an example. When we conducted a bioremediation experiment in Hull Beach, we were dealing with fuel-contaminated sludge from a pond. The first thing we did was we set out some test plots on site, in situ, and we added varying amounts of nutrients to each of these, and varying amounts of nutrients to each of these, and varying amount of oxygen and aeration. At the same time, we took some samples back, and they were tested in the lab, in test tubes, on shaker tables, over the winter, under varying conditions, under warm weather conditions, cold weather conditions, varying amounts of nutrients. And from that we attempted to come up with a method by which we could remediate the site, which we did.

Now, I don't want to get into the nitty-gritty of the report. If you really want to see the Hull Beach report I'll be happy to provide it to you. In fact, I presented a paper

on this project several years ago, in Edmonton. I'll be happy to provide you with a copy of the paper, but this is the sort of thing that I would be looking at. But first off, what you need to do is to find yourself a qualified firm, and engineering firm - and I think most engineering firms nowadays are capable of handling this - and ask their advice. And it's like that they might suggest the same thing.

Thank-you, Mr. Chairman.

TK: Thank-you, Mr. Eno. Are there any questions from the joint interveners, DIAND, DFO and Environment Canada? Thank-you. Are there any questions from Community Government and Transportation? Thank-you. Are there any questions from Baffin Health and Social Services? Thank-you. Are there any questions from Mr. Marcel Mason? Thank-you. Are there any questions from the floor? I don't see any. Are there any questions from the Nunavut Water Board Staff? Dionne.

DF: Thank-you, Mr. Chairman. Dionne Filiatrault. You alluded, in your presentation, to inspections of the dykes and the dam, and Chris spoke earlier in that regard with the Dam Safety Guidelines. I just want to confirm, does Department of Sustainable Development feel that the definition in the guideline for dam is applicable in this case?

CN: Chris Nichols, Department of Sustainable Development. I think, in my experience that I've gained in the consulting industry, the geotechnical consulting industry, and my experience again with Sustainable Development over the years, I think that yes, that the definition as outlined in the Canadian Dam Safety Guidelines does apply to both.

TK: Thank-you. Thank-you Mr. Eno, Mr. Nichols. Thank-you. Let's take a ten-minute break, okay?

[break]

SH: ...to health at his point, so I'll deal with it first.

In terms of the supply of Lake Geraldine and the water treatment plant itself, so far Health applauds the changes that the municipality of Iqaluit has done in the past year, in terms of improving the plant, and we have very little problems at all with the water quality, or the water catchment area, in terms of safety of the supply for the public.

As noted in other submissions, the town is looking at long-term supplies, and we'll be very interested to see the results of those studies.

In terms of the sewage treatment and disposal system, again, this is a very important municipal infrastructure system that can affect the health of the population quite significantly, and the present lagoon system, although it's old and outdated, and really needs to be replaced, looks like it may serve as a back-up for the new plant once it's operational. Now, the only concern I have with that is that if they're going to use that

site as a back-up, something that was mentioned this morning, fencing the site in case they have sludge laying there for a while, personally I think that - and from my department's point of view - that should be done anyway. You don't want people falling into sewage. And I know that's happened in the past, here, people driving into it.

So, I would like to see, as part of their plan to... and I didn't actually put that in my submission, but if they're intending to use that site as a back-up site, or use it in terms of anything like that, to get the site fenced to keep people out of it when there are hazardous materials in there. Plus, it is still then a concern for the Water Board, since anything that goes in there may actually get out to contaminate water. So, the maintenance of that site for emergency purposes I think has to be at least the inspection on the yearly basis to maintain integrity, and I believe the municipality has stated that they will be doing so.

In regards to new sewage system, what I've read about the plan for the system looks good. The one concern, as with Sustainable, is the composting of the sludge. And considering that composting, to be effective, requires aeration and warmer temperatures in the sludge for it to be effective, and aerobic rather than anaerobic, which would mean less smell as opposed to more smell, and more effective at getting rid of hazardous microbial growth, hazardous bacteria, virus, etc., I'm not sure that the plan they have now will achieve either the aeration necessary, or the temperatures necessary for effective composting. And I would like to see more information on that prior to the municipality using it.

Other than that, I would just consider that they're not actually treating the sludge, they're just piling up for... at the dump, as any other garbage would be piled there, and nothing happening to it.

I think the plan for the sludge was that something would be done with it so that it wasn't just piled in the dump, and I don't think that their idea on composting, at this point, with the information I have, has much merit.

In terms of solid waste management, I am very concerned about the present site and its lifespan, and the plans to get new sites in place. We haven't seen any plans that the Water Board could assess for effects of waste into water from new sites, because we don't know where they're going. We know we're looking at an incinerator and a type of landfill, but we don't know what type, or if it's going to be engineered, if there's going to be liners, if there's going to be effluent... I mean, leachate collection, or anything like that.

Until those questions are answered, I'm not sure that the Water Board can actually license or even speak to licensing that sort of new plan. We just don't have the information.

I believe that the municipality needs to also provide, when they do have plans for that, complete, revised operation manuals for those sites to deal with water flow over, through, leachate from any new landfill site.

I don't think that the incinerator is something that's going to be a concern of the Water Board at this point. Having said that, I also think that it will be a great improvement over what they have out there right now.

The other concern I have with the solid waste management is the contingency plan. The town was suggesting having a contingency plan for, I believe it was the end of August, to be submitted. That gives us almost no time to review it, and review its ability to meet requirements, or for them to implement it in terms of the expected end of life for the old site in October of 2001.

For that reason I think we need to see that plan much earlier than the town has suggested, probably at the beginning of the new construction season next year, June... end of June, maybe, would be the latest I would want to see a contingency plan for us to evaluate. I don't know about anyone else, but I like having at least a month to two months to evaluate a plan of that type.

And again, I think that that plan will be of significant concern to the Water Board due to where the town has indicated the expansion of the present site will be, in terms of how will it, or will it, affect water around the site. For that reason, I don't think that we can really address waste management issues at this time.

There's one further issue that wasn't in my submission, and that was the hazardous waste issue. Now, it was stated by the town they didn't believe the Water Board had any jurisdiction over that. I am of the exact opposite opinion. Hazardous waste in a community, if it's not... if there's nowhere to dispose of it, can get into any water system, including our drinking water system, depending on who takes it here. For that reason, and because under the general sanitation regulations of the Public Health Act, the municipality is actually required to provide waste disposal for the community. I think at least the public, the household hazardous waste, there must be a plan and a provision for the collection and proper storage and disposal of that waste. In terms of commercial and industrial waste, that is a different situation, where that is the responsibility of the businesses, but in terms of the public, the household hazardous wastes, the fuel oil, the oil from boats, from ski-doo's, the batteries, the town has to have a

plan for that, and a plan that takes into account the protection of the environment of the town and the water supplies and water courses around here. So I believe that is directly in the Board's jurisdiction for that.

Finally the Department of Health recommends that the license duration be limited to a period not exceeding three years, and the reason for that is we're at a critical stage in the infrastructure development of Iqaluit. As you all know, our waste disposal site is at the end of its life. Water, although okay, we're not sure of its long-term capability, and sewage, again, that is a big concern. Without adequate infrastructure, there's risk to the whole community in terms of if the infrastructure system breaks down, the health of the community could very well be significantly affected.

And this sort of breakdown in infrastructure leads to the exact reason the Board was formed, to use... to deal with the impact on water use, and the deposition of waste into water. I can't stress strongly enough the fact that we can't allow it to go five years. We don't have that time luxury any more. We're right at the end of the life of the dump, we're... the sewage system we expect to be operational soon, hopefully, and the water system the town's already planning, they've already identified that as a concern. So I think that within three years they should have a very good idea of any changes they'll have to make in terms of the water. They'll also have to have established a new waste disposal system, a new sewage disposal system should be up and running, and there may even, hopefully, be a year's worth of data collected on how they're operating.

In terms of the... going farther, longer than that, I would be seriously concerned that given a longer period before we come back to review wouldn't serve anyone's interest, that at that point the town should have had enough time to get these new programs in place, and get information on what needs to be done next. Or nothing. Who knows? The water may turn out to be perfectly fine for the next 20 years. But if not, at least we'll... by that time they'll have the information to bring back to the Board, and have a much better chance of having a complete water license submission that covers all areas for a longer-term license at that point, hopefully.

In terms of... I'll just speak quickly to the application for approvals, or for systems. Under the Public Water Supply Regulation, Public Service Supply Regulations, approvals are required from Health before any changes can be made, at all. So, I expect the town will be submitting any proposed changes as soon as they know what changes they're proposing. And although, under the general sanitation regulation, there is no specific requirement for approval, because of the concern that Health has over waste disposal and protection of the community, any plans in terms of operation of new sites,

planning of new sites, and siting of new waste disposal sites, it would be prudent to have Health review them before they're implemented, simply because under the regulations, if we see something that we consider a... or the Chief Medical Health Officer considers a threat to public health, it could end up stopping it in its tracks, and we don't want that to happen, we want these things to proceed with the minimum of disruption.

The pace of change in this community has been huge. When I got here about three years ago, it was much smaller, and much slower-paced, in terms of my first six months here. Since that time, I'm having trouble believing how quickly Iqaluit's changing, how many new faces I'm seeing, how many new buildings, how much of a stress it is on all the systems. And for the protection of the health, I think that the systems of sewage water and waste have to be priorities, and I believe that your Board has a significant part to play in ensuring that Iqaluit has what's needed for the next 20 years.

Thank-you for your time, and I'd be open to answering any questions that anyone has.

TK: Thank-you. Are there any questions from the applicant for Baffin Health and Social services?

JT: John Tidball, Mr. Chair. No, we have no questions. Thank-you.

TK: Thank-you. Are there any questions from the joint interveners, DIAND, DFO and Environment Canada? Thank-you. Are there any questions from Community Government and Transportation? Thank-you. Are there any questions from Mr. Marcel Mason? Thank-you. Are there any questions from the floor? Thank-you. Are there any questions from the Water Board Staff?

BT: A real small one. _____ at the beginning. It's Bill Tilleman. You filed as Exhibit #12 the Health and Social Services written submission, which is this one here, dated November 7th. Was there another exhibit that we need to know about?

SH: Yes. Susan Hardy, Mr. Chair. The other exhibit I just wanted to refer to was that Sustainable had filed a letter, and I don't believe that was entered as an exhibit during their submission.

SP: That one's marked as #11, so we have no questions, Mr. Chairman. We'll mark those accordingly.

TK: Okay. Thank-you very much. Okay, we'll take a break and come back at 7:00. Mr. Mason will be making his presentation. Thank-you, and we'll see you back here at 7 o'clock tonight.

[break]

TK: ...we left off, if I can call upon Mr. Marcel Mason, intervener.

JT: Thank-you, Mr. Mason. Can you please spell your name for the record?

MM: My name is Marcel Mason, m-a-r-c-e-l, last name m-a-s-o-n.

JT: Do you affirm that the evidence that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Do you so affirm?

MM: I do.

JT: Thank-you.

MM: As I said, my name is Marcel Mason. First off, I would like to thank the Board for allowing me to reschedule this, as well as the other interveners who didn't mind getting bumped up. Unfortunately, a couple of the overheads that I wanted to show tonight were not delivered to me when they were supposed to have been. That is the reason for the delay.

My presentation is fairly short, and it's of a non-technical nature. It's based primarily on observations over the time that I have lived here, and the period since we last had a hearing.

As other interveners have said, the municipality has made quite a bit of progress over the last year, and I think they should be commended for that. They've started a process that will hopefully address some what I feel are very serious issues, and in working with Mr. Butler as a member of the Solid Waste Management Steering Committee, and Matthew Hough, who is also involved with the committee, things look hopeful. I've also known the new mayor, John Matthews, for quite a number of years, and what I know about John also makes me hopeful.

The fact is, though, that the progress that has been made has been made largely on paper, and we don't have a lot of progress that we can actually reach out and touch. A little over a year ago many of us sat in this same room and, if my recollections are correct - and I'm definitely willing to be corrected on it if I'm wrong - the municipality discussed a new sewage treatment plant that would probably be on-line by February. We're now looking at potentially February a year after that.

In the last application that the municipality made to the Water Board for a water license, they addressed a few issues. They stated the public concerns were smoke and debris from open burning. Those concerns remain. I do have a couple of overheads that I'll be showing at the end, which are related to this, but a little over a year ago the municipality said they would address this issue by further restricting the hours of burning, and more segregation of waste prior to burning. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this does not appear to have happened.

The municipality continues to pollute the environment, and I use the definitions of contaminant that are contained in the Nunavut statutes which we inherited from the Government of the North West Territories - to my understand there's been no change in those - contaminant being defined as any solid, liquid, gas, odour, heat, sound or vibration, or any combination of them, the release of which into the environment causes or contributes to the impairment of the quality of the environment, causes harm or material discomfort to any person, or adversely affects or impairs the health and safety of any person, or renders the environment unfit for use by any plant or animal life, or by any person.

In the same Act, the environment is further defined as the components of earth within the territories, and includes all air, land, water, snow and ice.

I would, at this point, like to address an item that you brought up, that you asked, if I understood correctly, the interveners to comment on, which was whether or not the Water Board had a role to play in solid waste management, or if that was within their mandate. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that because we the actions of the municipality that do contaminate our living environment, their actions or inactions that do pollute our environment, and we do not see any of the other agencies involved in this, apparently, doing anything, that many people of the public - myself included - look to the Water Board to do something about this, as this is really the only public and open forum we have for bringing those concerns forward.

So, possibly it is just a perception that the Water Board does have authority in this area. Possibly it's a reality. I mention that possibly it's a reality because in the water license application, specifically in the supplementary questionnaire from municipalities, solid waste disposal is specifically... or, gets a specific section of the document. It doesn't say solid waste disposal...

[End of Tape 6 - Side A]

[Start of Tape 6 - Side B]

MM: ...as their legal counsel said this morning, said we do not believe this is within the mandate of the Water Board, and left that section blank.

I note, also, that the other interveners have also, regardless of what their counsel's stance may or may not be on this issue, have also seen these forms before, both the federal level and the territorial governments, levels of government, have seen these forms before, have seen these headings in there, have seen the questions that are asked, and unless they have contacted the Board directly, which I don't know if they have or not,

they have let it stand in the application, as opposed to saying you should not be asking these questions, it's not within your mandate.

So, I think there really is some agreement, at least on some level, that this potentially is part of the role of the Water Board. And as I say, from a public perspective, from the perspective of just a resident of the community, because we do not see other regulator agencies stepping in and taking action, we look to the Water Board to possibly do this, to fill this void that has been left by the other agencies. Whether we should do that or not, I guess, is up to the legal minds that will discuss this further.

As part of the written intervention that I submitted to the Board, I ask for a couple of things, restrictions on burning, specifically, that said that no burning at any time of the year when the wind direction could cause smoke from the landfill to move into the community. I believe I asked for this a little over a year ago, as well, at the proceedings then. And no burning between the dates of April 15th and the 1st of October when the wind direction could cause smoke from the landfill to move over the causeway area, the north 40 recreational area, or the Sylvia Grennell Park area.

Me reasons for this type of request are the contaminants generated by the municipal open burn are toxic, specifically, plastics when burnt in low temperature create some very toxic materials. A report that was on CBC radio last month, by a worker from the United Nations, I might add, specifically mentioned the dioxins and ferrins that were being created during open burning. We also know that there are certain stabilisers - things that make plastic stiff - used, one of them being cadmium, which is... in the periodic table it's a heavy element, and it can cause serious health problems.

Unfortunately, these issues were not addressed in the last license. I certainly hope that they are addressed in this particular license.

With regard to the abandonment and restoration of previous used municipal sites, again we see... right now we see a commitment, or a stated commitment on the part of the municipality to, within a year or so, develop plans, I believe, for abandonment and restoration of the previously used landfills. We still see, across the inlet, the old landfill that was used prior to this one, located on the side of a hill, with refuse exposed on the side of the hill, and water running through it directly into the ocean. Now, I realise that the oceans are the responsibility of the federal level of the department and not the Water Board, but it is a problem.

The issue of enforcement is still a matter of concern, at least to me. This was a topic that was discussed at fairly great length at the last Water Board hearing, and I don't know if indeed any resolution was arrived at after that process or not. From outward

appearances, I don't think it was. We still have many of the same processes taking place, many of the same problems are still in place, and it remains that nothing happens, at least to outward appearances. So, that issue, it would seem, still requires some sort of resolution.

The... I mentioned to Rob Eno after his presentation that if he was the bad guy then I was the really bad guy, because he said two years would be a reasonable length of time, and I say that two years is probably one year too long. I say that because over the one-year period since the last hearing, a little over... more than one year, concrete progress, something that we can touch, hasn't taken place. I remember, at the last meetings, different people from the town sitting there saying, 'Things are going to be different now. We've got our act together. We're moving forward.' And to some degree, as I say, on paper, there has been movement forward, but nothing that we can look at and say, 'Yes, this is concrete, physical progress.'

That issue, coupled with the issue of enforcement, which as I stated in the written intervention, that until the issue of enforcement is really straightened out so that the public of Nunavut knows who is responsible for exactly what, then possibly it would be a mistake for the Water Board to issue any license in excess of one year, at least until such time as that issue is settled.

Just before... sort a quick summary of the written intervention, just before I conclude this by popping up a couple of overheads, I would like to address a comment this morning by Mr. Tidball, legal counsel for the municipality, who mentioned by-law... and I believe it was number 200, which makes the discharge of harmful materials against municipal regulation. I wasn't aware that that by-law existed. I'm quite happy that it does. However, a statement was made along the lines that if an individual saw something along those lines happening, that possibly they should report it to the municipality, which I completely agree with. However, the municipality has a number of other by-laws, traffic by-laws, for example, and in traffic by-laws they have people who are out there every day of the week just making sure that I, personally, am following the regulations. They have by-law officers who are making sure that I follow the regulation of coming to a full and complete stop at every stop sign, that I have a seatbelt, that I have a driver's license, that my registration and insurance is in the vehicle with me.

If there is a by-law... or, as there is a by-law in place, I guess the question that I would have to ask is why is this by-law not enforced as the traffic by-law is?

At this point, I'd like to quickly toss up a couple of overheads, which would show the Water Board members and staff who don't live here on a regular basis some of the

items I'm talking about, and maybe give a little bit of explanation about them, if that is okay.

Can I take this with me? Thank-you.

I never thought I'd be in front of an audience with a mike in my hand!

Well, they didn't do a really good job on this one! This is a picture that was taken on the 22nd day of August, this year. The picture is rather dim. This is actually a sea-lift vessel. This is the town, and this is a cloud of smoke that's hanging over the town. This cloud of smoke covered the town area, covered the Tundra Valley subdivision, the airport, as I remember. I was standing up on a hill when I took a picture of this, and due to the colour of the smoke you actually had difficulty making out the airport terminal building. And this cloud of smoke extended both ways, both east and west. Definitely over inland waters. Any chemicals or particles that were coming out of that smoke were not only falling on the tidal flats to be picked up the next time the tide came in, but they were falling on the river, the fresh water on the other side, and very potentially in our drinking water source.

Maybe if I move it up a little bit... this image was taken on the same day. The red spot here is the fire, whatever was burning that day. Normally the smoke that we see coming off the landfill is sort of a smoky grey colour, like this, which to my understanding is normal household refuse they generally burn like that. What we see here is a large cloud of black smoke generated, I assume - and quite frankly this is only an assumption - by something of a far different nature than what we would generally throw away from our house. It was mixed in with the... you see the smoke coming - both types of smoke - coming from the same area, which leads me to believe that the sorting at the landfill is either extremely minimal or not done at all.

Mr. Chairman, this one... I didn't put a date on this one, so actually I'm not sure of the actual date of it. This was a fire at the municipal landfill where the fire department was called out to help do something about a burn that was out of control and producing, again, some extremely black smoke. You can see that we're getting into an area... this is part of the dump that is not normally burnt. I guess that's the soak end of the dump, where vehicles, tires, appliances, and whatnot go. We seem to be fairly close to that area of the dump. There's a lot of tires here, and that would be a very serious matter, if the tires had decided to go as well.

This is, Mr. Chairman, the last image. It's an image taken with a digital camera. It's taken from the south end, with the camera pointing up this way. In behind the smoke you would see - if you could see through the smoke - you would see the sewage lagoon,

some of the buildings that are across the way on the west 40. This image is to basically tie the problem of pollutants into water. Again, I know, as it has been said a multiple times, it's only fresh water that the Water Board is concerned with. However, the smoke from that particular fire fell on the ice, the ice melted, the contaminants were in the water.

Those images, Mr. Chairman, which I'll be giving to your staff - I have copies of them at home - if anybody's interested they're also freely available on the Internet. I've posted them on my personal web site in case anyone else is interested in grabbing copies of them and printing them out. But they also illustrate, possibly, why members of the public such as myself look to the Water Board to try and address this issue. This is something that our agencies in town see, but apparently don't do anything about.

Again, as I mentioned in my written submission, I would not feel comfortable with giving the municipality a multi-year water license until we have a little bit more of a track record from the new administration, and from the new mayor in council. Thank-you.

TK: Are there any questions from the applicant to Mr. Mason? Thank-you. Are there any questions from the joint interveners, DIAND, DFO and Environment Canada for Mr. Mason? Thank-you. Are there any questions for Mr. Mason from Community Government and Transportation? Are there any questions from Baffin Health and Social Services for Mr. Mason? Thank-you. Are there any questions from the floor to be addressed to Mr. Mason? Are there any questions from the Nunavut Water Board staff for Mr. Mason? Thank-you. Mr. Tilleman.

BT: And it is, on the exhibits, we will file and mark them as #13, Mr. Mason's presentation as #14, Mr. Mason's slides _____, and related to that _____ stated it. So, #13 would be Mr. Mason's written presentation, Exhibit #13, and Exhibit #14 would be Mr. Mason's slides, and we'll mark them accordingly. And also related to that would be, do you have a date for the pictures? I know that you mentioned that two of the slides, at least, were taken on the same date. Do you remember when that was, or is that on your web site?

MM: Actually, that is... sorry, Marcel Mason. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I believe the dates for those photos are in fact on the web site, the address of which I would be more than happy to provide to the staff. They could mark the entire web site as an exhibit.

BT: And it is...? So, Mr. Chairman, it would be helpful if we knew the address, because other people in the audience may want to look it up and pull the photos off.

MM: Marcel Mason, Mr. Chairman. The address of the web site is www.nunanet.com, followed by a forward slash, a tilde - which is the little squiggly that you will find up in the top left-hand corner of your keyboard. "Squiggly" is geek-speak, highly technical in nature, which flies in the face of my non-technical presentation, I guess! A tilde, mason, m-m-a-s-o-n.

TK: Thank-you. Mr. Robert Eno, do you have a question for Mr. Mason? Thank-you. Any further questions from the Water Board? Thank-you, Mr. Mason.

We have one individual who advised the Chairperson that he wished to speak. If Mr. Mackenzie is around, please? Would you please come up?

JT: Please state your name for the record, and spell your name.

WM: William A.M.G Mackenzie, m-a-c-k-e-n-z-i-e.

JT: Do you swear that the evidence you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

WM: I do.

JT: Thank-you.

TK: Thank-you. Mr. Mackenzie, please proceed with your presentation.

WM: Well, there's nothing written. I find this exercise, the part given by the municipality of Iqaluit, not to really represent the people of this town. There's been no consultation with this community, with the shareholders of the municipality, the taxpayers, and other people. This document is the creation of the staff of the municipality. I would have thought that the new council would at least have called a meeting to get the input from the citizens of this community in regard to this very important matter.

The... you're aware, I'm sure, that there's a real boondoggle gone on with this whole process of our water license, garbage disposal, sewage treatment, etc., and unfortunately, the municipality of Iqaluit has not included the community in these discussions. The people who pay for the system, the shareholders of the municipal corporation, the taxpayers, have never been consulted, and whatever decision that you people come to will have a big... reflect on the community and the people that own property in this town.

The municipality asks for the right to take so many litres of water out of the lake, Lake Geraldine. I believe there's been some problems, maybe with the dam, or the berms of that lake. In the fall of '99 there were certain measures taken by the municipality. They were hauling fill up there for some reason, and there was a lot of water in that small river coming out from the dam.

I think that there should be a study made on the dam site, and the berms to anchor the ends of the dam, to make sure that this facility is adequate to meet the needs of the community. As you may or may not know, the lake, Geraldine, the dam has been raised twice since it has been built. Across the middle of that lake there's a spine of rock which precludes getting at all the water in the lake, and it was recommended many years ago, I believe in 1970, when they started having water pumped down the hill to serve the community, that this spine of rock be taken out, and that would give a larger access to all of the lake. The municipality has never continued that, or done anything on that recommendation. So, I believe there was ideas to trench, or to get at other water that flows into that lake.

In Mr. Hough's presentation, he mentioned that - and that was the municipality of Iqaluit - that they had certain responsibilities re. the dump sites in Iqaluit. Well, I've been here 36 years, and during that time the municipality of Iqaluit, or the settlement, as it was back then, used the dump at the Grennel River for domestic garbage, the north 40 was used for metals, building material, etc. It used to be burnt quite regularly, and the Apex Hill dump site.

The community has the responsibility for doing something that dump in the north 40. It was used as a domestic garbage dump throughout the years, and after the dump in Apex was closed - which was likely in 1977 or '78, and before what was called the Honey Bucket Hill, which was across from the community was opened as a dump - the dump on the north 40 was used. The dump that we now use, or as it is now called, the waste facility, was supposed to be able to contain any draining of effluent or contaminants into our water supply, the lake, Frobisher Bay, was a proposal given by the Government of the North West Territories. The community... it was given to the community for their permission to go ahead with it, and the community said no. It was turned down, on a public vote, because at that time the Government of the North West Territories, and the municipality, were not facing the whole picture in reference to the disposal of garbage. The burnable garbage, the community was in favour of an incinerator. We got the \$500,000 dump, which actually turned out to cost \$630,000.

We have now ventured into building a sewage disposal system. This system... this has never been consulted with the taxpayers, or the people of the community. This was the brainchild of the administration of this community, had no input at all from the people. There are certain problem with this site. The municipality was made aware of this early enough to do something about it. They did nothing. I talked to the city of Powell River this afternoon, a community in British Columbia, where they have a

system, as we are here, this seaweed system. Their system is up and running. It works barely, and is extremely expensive to operate. And if the municipality of Iqaluit be given a license to operate that thing, it will bankrupt this community. It's like buying a Bentley when you need a Ford. It's an expensive... and actually the people in British Columbia don't think it would work very good here in our cold temperatures.

[End of Tape 6]