

From: Ron Kent [Ron@fsc.ca]  
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2006 10:46 AM  
To: tech3@nwb.nunavut.ca  
Cc: TParsons@GOV.NU.CA; licensing@nwb.nunavut.ca;  
licensingtrainee@nwb.nunavut.ca  
Subject: RE: NWB3HAL0308 - Decommissioning the Hall Beach sewage lagoon

2005-0670

Hi Sarah.

I'll write notes after each of your paragraphs.

I hope I have clarified the remaining points.

The question about the sludge sample at the end will require some additional research, but I wonder given all the other information, the simplicity of the site itself, and the proposed remediation plan, if the information is crucial? Please advise.

Please advise also if I have addressed the other questions with this response.

Regards

Ron

>>> Sarah Gagné <tech3@nwb.nunavut.ca> 6/16/2006 8:37:33 AM >>>  
HI Ron,

I've been going through some of the information from 2003 regarding the decommissioning of the sewage lagoon and found the attached letter Jim Wall sent to CGS, then CGT.

Jim's letter is new to me or I would have addressed all the points more formally.

The Trow report answers some of the points in the letter but not all of them. Specifically, the report sufficiently responds to the second point Part G Item 1, ix and xi but the other points are not answered sufficiently in the report. Some of the other items may be covered in the tender drawings?

iv - we are not aware of any adjacent sites that may require remediation.

v. - there is no leachate generation potential as the sludge meets guideline requirements. There are no anticipated freezing dynamics as the sludge is to be blended into the granular materials rather than left in a single strata.

viii - I believe our plans addressed these points, some are not applicable including berms, new monitoring wells and liners. When complete the site is proposed to be a vacant field that drains positively to the ocean.

In addition, during the review of the AR plan by interested persons, the following points were raised and require further clarification before

proceeding:

1. Is there any standing water in the larger southern lagoon cell? If standing water is present, what is planned for this water? Will it be pumped into the northern cell that has been incorporated into the new lagoon system?

If by southern lagoon cell, you mean the one we plan to remediate, there is standing water that is snow melt water that meets CCME quality for direct discharge. It is planned to do just that. It is not intended to pump the water into the lagoon as that will just contaminate it and unnecessarily load the lagoon. Even if it didn't meet CCME it would still be better than the licence limit for the lagoon effluent and could be direct discharged. Unless we are required to discharge it to the lagoon, it will be discharged to the ocean in a manner that prevents erosion during pumping.

2. The Trow report indicates that additional lagoon sludge analytical results were previously obtained by CGS, is this the sample result collected by ESG on behalf of Mosher submitted to the Board in 2004? Regardless, these additional sample results should be incorporated into the report and assessment of the sludge in the lagoon. If Trow decided not to include the result provided by CGS, please provide the reason.

I'll have to get back to you on this, if it's really needed for a decision.

end