

May 28, 1996

Janice Conroy
Office Coordinator
Technical Advisory Committee, Water Resources
3rd Floor Bellanca Building
Yellowknife, NT, X1A 2R3

1441
TAC

Dear Jan:

Re: Kimmirut (Lake Harbour) Sanitation Site Planning Study.

On behalf of the Environmental Protection Branch, Environment Canada, I have reviewed the information submitted with the above application. The following advice is provided pursuant to section 12(3) of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Recognizing the Department of Indian and Northern as the responsible authority for this proposal, EPB's contribution to your request for specialist advise is based primarily on the mandated responsibilities for the enforcement of Section 36 (3) of the *Fisheries Act* and the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act (CEPA)*. On the basis of the information provided EPB believes that the above noted proposal has the potential to affect fish pursuant to the *Fisheries Act*.

Comments:

My comments will be restricted to the suggested choice of Site #3 (Southern Valley area) as a sanitation site. Given the restriction of suitable useable area for this community site #3 offers a location that has the largest area of wetlands available. However whether this particular site will provide sufficient secondary or tertiary treatment is questionable. The reason for questioning this level of treatment is that the majority of the years sewage could be represented as a frozen mass. This aspect was not discussed within this report. Also to compare this wetland treatment to the Hay River or Yellowknife site is not acceptable as in both cases Hay River and Yellowknife have extensive area of wetlands located on low gradient terrain.

Another option that could be evaluated for this site would be to have a mechanical treatment plant (This would include a SBR) discharging into the Site #3 wetlands treatment area. This would up the costs of the facility, but would provide for a much better effluent quality going to the receiving environment.

There was no information provided on the environmental impacts that the existing facilities is having on the receiving environment (Glasgow Bay). Is there local harvesting occurring in the immediate area or is there sensitive habitat within the affected area. This type of information is important and should be brought into the equation when evaluating for an appropriate treatment system.

In conclusion several options were evaluated and with one being recommended by the consultants, but no indication was given as to the choice that MACA will be making. Can we anticipate that MACA will be submitting, in the future, a proposal which will contain the recommended option of this document or will it contain a new option.

If you have any questions please contact me at 920-6062.

Sincerely

Stephen Harbicht

cc. Laura Johnston District Manager, EPB, Yellowknife.