



Minutes of Meeting

Sewage Lagoon and Solid Waste Disposal Facility, Kugluktuk, NU April 9, 2007 **FINAL MINUTES**

Meeting Date	March 02, 2007
Time	12:00 p.m. Central Time
Location	Teleconference Meeting (Cambridge Bay, Gjoa Haven, Resolute, Iqaluit, & Winnipeg)
Main Topics	Status of Water License Application with NWB
File Number	FEO 09754.310

Those in attendance were:

Sudhir Jha, E.I.T.	Project Officer, Government of Nunavut (GN) (Cambridge Bay)
Navjit Sidhu, E.I.T.	Former Project Officer Government of Nunavut (GN) (Cambridge Bay)
Tom Livingston, P. Eng.	Regional Municipal Planning Engineer, Government of Nunavut (GN) (Cambridge Bay)
Jim Rogers	INAC, (Iqaluit)
David Abernathy	INAC, (Iqaluit)
Bathram	INAC, (Iqaluit)
Gerry Popowich, P. Eng.	Nuna Burnside (Winnipeg)
John Kuchak, C.E.T.	Nuna Burnside (Winnipeg)
Zhong Liu	Nunavut Water Board
Joe Murdock	Nunavut Water Board
Jamie Van Gulck, P. Eng.	VGQ Consulting

The following Items were discussed:

**Action
Items:**

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ NWB received and reviewed Hamlet of Kugluktuk's water license application and the engineering reports on sewage lagoon and solid waste landfill by Nuna Burnside.▪ NWB submitted their review comments Oct. 24, 2006 to the Hamlet requesting clarification of various issues. Nuna Burnside submitted their response Jan. 26, 2007 to NWB. NWB received |
|----|---|

Info

Nuna Burnside's response Feb. '07.

- GN request conference call to review Nuna Burnside's response to NWB comments. Hamlet not at this meeting as GN is representing Hamlet.

2. NWB has not responded to Nuna's Jan. 26th submission. info

3. NWB stated that they had concerns about the closing paragraphs of Nuna Burnside's response regarding NWB providing details on the design and study parameters that consultants should provide. NWB stated that NWB does not perform designs. It is consultants' responsibility. info

4. NWB has enough information in Nuna Burnside's response for a formal ruling; however, NWB has noted several inconsistencies & errors in answers to specific questions. GN called meeting to provide Nuna with another opportunity to review their response & re-submit it with additional information & corrections to the specific questions. info

Following the receipt of the re-submission, NWB will issue a formal reply. If NWB further finds inconsistencies or omissions to their specific questions, the formal would deny the application due to inconsistent information and omissions.

5. Nuna stated there appears to be a misunderstanding in the NWB approval process. The approach that the GN and Nuna Burnside took was to respond to each of the NWB comments. Once there was a general agreement on our response we would revise all documents and resubmit the NWB application. info

It appears the NWB did not want to receive responses to their comments, but have the NWB application revised to add their comments and then resubmit the entire application to NWB.

NWB points out that their formal decision will be made once Nuna Burnside states that their submission is final. NWB is not in a position to continue reviewing subsequent submissions.

6. GN stated that they were aware that all questions were answered. Asks NWB for clarification. info

7. NWB provided some examples as follows: info

- Stability analysis for landfill – questions answered pertained to the stability of the lagoon.
- Stability analysis for solid waste berms was not specific to the actual design configurations.
- Stability analysis for lagoon did not address Nuna Burnside's design concepts of using a liner resulting in an inconsistency between proposed design & analysis.

8. Nuna Burnside stated that AMEC did not provide the berm with the liner because it was not critical to the analysis. Info
 9. Nuna Burnside suggested that it may be best if NWB's consultant, Dr. Jamie Van Gulck of VGQ Consulting & Dr. Alexandre Tchekhovski of Amec communicate together regarding geotechnical concerns. Info
 10. GN has concerns that if a license is not granted soon, the construction season will be lost and the project will not go ahead this year & possibly not at all. The general contractor has been very cooperative-wishes to perform the work & has held his tender price. The GN does not want to lose the contractor – if they pull out, a replacement that the GN is confident with may not be available. GN/
Nuna
- GN requests that it is in everyone's interest to move the process along. The GN and Nuna Burnside are to meet shortly, map out their response to NWB design questions.
11. INAC suggested that GN should possibly not let out contracts before the NWB approves applications for water licenses. To quickly move the application process forward, applications should be submitted to NWB at least 60 days in advance of the required approval date. INAC
 12. NWB suggested that Nuna review their response and if they feel their Jan 26th response is final, then NWB can make their ruling. INAC suggested that if Nuna Burnside's response is final, they are to submit a letter stating it is final. GN
INAC
 13. Nuna requested if NWB could highlight the areas where more information is required in Nuna Burnside's Jan. 26th response. NWB stated that they could not due to time constraints. How does Nuna know if they have provided a satisfactory response to a NWB question, if the NWB doesn't acknowledge if Nuna response is satisfactory? NWB
Nuna

14. GN felt that NWB had additional comments and questions to their response. GN re-iterated that GN & Nuna Burnside would review the response & re-submit a consistent document. Info
15. VGQ Consulting, geotechnical consultant to NWB cited the following examples of inconsistencies that required clarifications: Info
- Geotechnical analyses inconsistent with design concepts
 - Details in engineering drawings inconsistent to specifications.
 - Details of proposed key trench for liner not shown.
 - Engineering specifications are to be included with application – insufficient detail for construction & liner installation.
 - Engineering specification states that native soils to be used for berm constructions, but does not specify the acceptable & unacceptable soil types.
 - Some confusion exists if a liner will be used in the lagoon. If so, which of Amec's options, #1 or #2, will be used? How will the liner be installed? A clear statement is needed to state that liner would perform as intended.
 - Landfill – geotechnical stability & seepage analyses not given.
 - Lagoon requires a liner but not the landfill, yet berms of both are constructed of the same materials.
 - Some confusion if permafrost will enter berms.
 - Land farm
 - Operation procedures not provided – states that its Hamlet's responsibility to respond – not sufficient.
 - Operation procedures of facility are to be designed if operation is to be successful by Hamlet.
 - Hamlet must know what operations are needed.
 - Sampling / test procedures to be specified for samples hauled
16. GN asks if NWB requires O & M Manuals at this time. Normally document is developed during construction & provided before project completion. GN Nuna
17. INAC states that O & M manuals are to be provided before project completion is signed off. VGQ Consulting further states that if O & M manuals are found to be inconsistent to design, approval may not be granted. info

GN stated that Jamie Van Gulck of VGQ Consulting could be reached through Zhong Liu of NWB.

18. GN & Nuna Burnside will arrange teleconference meeting to address GN/
NWB's concerns regarding Nuna's Jan. 26 response to NWB. Nuna
19. Info not related to agenda - INAC commented that INAC & possibly info
the NTWWA wants to hold a workshop on lagoon designs and
construction practices in northern environments to provide a better
understanding of problems/concerns & all parties could provide input.

The preceding are the minutes of the meeting as observed by the undersigned. Should there be a need for revision, please advise within seven days. In the absence of notification to the contrary, these minutes will be deemed to be an accurate record of the meeting.

Minutes prepared by:
Nuna Burnside Engineering and Environmental Ltd.



Gerry Popowich, P. Eng.
Cc Attendees