

Phyllis Beaulieu

From: Livingston, Tom [TLivingston@GOV.NU.CA]
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2007 11:40 AM
To: Stephen Bathory
Cc: Jim Rogers; Sidhu, Navjit; jrwall@nunavutwaterboard.org; Phyllis Beaulieu; exec@nunavutwaterboard.org; Strong, Gary; David Abernethy; Slifka, Shane; Kilpatrick, Rosemary; Dawe, John
Subject: RE: RE: 3BM-PEL
Attachments: 2-Dillon Detailed Design - Kugaaruk Sewage.pdf; 2 -A- Table of Contents.pdf

Stephen,

Dillon's Detailed Design Report is titled "Detailed Design" on both its title page and in the table of contents. I have attached both the Detailed Design and the TOC again for your immediate reading.

NWB's November letter is answered, question by question (with each question numbered and re-printed for clarity) by either Dillon Consulting, the GN, or AMEC Engineering - and sometimes is clarified further by additional information or answers.

To avoid any confusion, I had requested that no previously-submitted reports, or versions of reports, be considered by the reviewers. This is the second go-round, and everything in this submission should be clear. The purpose is to answer all questions raised by NWBs' November letter, AND to answer all other questions raised by two subsequent letters from INAC, one from Environment Canada, and one from the GN Dept of Environment. The table of contents shows all this. The answers should be simple to read and to relate directly to each question.

However, I am somewhat confused. Not only is the entire submission located on NWB's FTP site, but I had previously, on July 19, sent the entire submission via several e-mails directly to David Abernathy of INAC so INAC reviewers would be able to start reading the documents (you were out of the office at that time, apparently). This is why I am more than a little surprised by your questions at this late date.

Stephen, this is in its second submission. The construction this season is already seriously in jeopardy due to the lateness of the season. The purpose of this work is to provide safe and sufficient treatment of sewage for a community whose facility has been clearly under-capacity and under-performing for many years. Our capital funding is extremely limited, and - as important - contractor availability is questionable after this season. In fact, the contractor - the *only one* to bid on this job - would have pulled all of its equipment from the community this year had it not been for this lagoon coming up, because its work on the DEW Line cleanup is complete. Next year there is a good probability that we would receive absolutely no bids for this work. Either that, or any bids we might receive (from contractors who would have to mobilize equipment and men unfamiliar with the community) may be beyond the available budget, giving us no choice but to cancel the tender. I do not see that this scenario is in the best interests of the people of Nunavut or of the environment. It is most important that this review be given the highest priority.

If you have any questions, please call me. I will be happy to discuss them with you.

8/7/2007

Sincerely,

Thomas G. Livingston, P. Eng.
Regional Municipal Planning Engineer
Kitikmeot Region, Nunavut
Community and Government Services
Enokhok Building, Cambridge Bay, X0B 0C0
ph: 867-983-4156
fax: 867-983-4124

-----Original Message-----

From: Stephen Bathory [mailto:BathoryS@inac-ainc.gc.ca]
Sent: August 3, 2007 9:27 AM
To: Livingston, Tom; jrwall@nunavutwaterboard.org; Phyllis Beaulieu
Cc: Jim Rogers
Subject: Fwd: RE: 3BM-PEL

hello folks,

i am looking for an update on my questions as seen below. tom perhaps you are able to help me out here. since it is still not clear which document is to be reviewed it is looking more and more like inac will be requesting an extension on the review of this file. i realize this is not ideal for anyone, but at this point in time inac has only assessed the file at face value. In the absence of direction as to the which file should be considered Dillon's Detailed Design Report, the August 7th due date does not provide us with enough time to thoroughly review this file. particularly, since our initial review submitted to the NWB did not encompass technical details.

thus, a timely response to this email, with clear direction on where Dillon's Detailed Design Report can be located is much appreciated.

i am going by the understanding that only the new information as presented on the FTP-site is to be assessed in our review, as proposed in the July 4th conference call.

thanks you for your time,

- stephen.

>>> Stephen Bathory 08/02/07 11:05 AM >>>

thanks fo the update, i spoke to jim walls about this. he said he will look into it in conjunction with you. i agree that only the the resubmitted documents should be considered (this was discussed in a conference call with the gn and dillion). however, in the new documents they are referencing a document called "Dillon's Detailed Design Report". I can't determine which document this is from the new information or the old information. this is not the easiest file to read through thus i have asked for clarification as time lines are too tight to perform mulitiple reviews of the same project. thanks again, stephen.

>>> "Phyllis Beaulieu" <licensing@nunavutwaterboard.org> 08/02/07 10:53

8/7/2007

AM >>>

I have asked the technical advisors to respond to your request. From what I can see in the file, only the resubmitted documents are to be considered during the review.

Phyllis Beaulieu
 Manager of Licensing
 Nunavut Water Board
 P.O. Box 119
 Gjoa Haven, NU X0B 1J0
 Phone: (867) 360-6338
 Fax: (867) 360-6369
 E-mail: licensing@nunavutwaterboard.org
 Visit our Web Page: www.nunavutwaterboard.org
 -----Original Message-----

From: Stephen Bathory [<mailto:BathoryS@inac-ainc.gc.ca>]
 Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2007 11:42 AM
 To: Phyllis Beaulieu
 Cc: 'David Hohnstein'; jrwall@nunavutwaterboard.org
 Subject: 3BM-PEL

Hello,

I have initiated my review of the updated material for the Kugaaruk sewage lagoon. Numerous sections of the document titled "Part 2 Responses to NWB Nov.14 06 letter" make reference to a document called Dillon's Detailed Design Report. It is not clear from the information posted on the FTP-site which document the applicant is intending to reference. Could you please provide me guidance on which file(s) should be considered Dillon's Detailed Design Report. Since time lines are tight with this review I hope this matter can be resolved quickly so as to avoid a request for extension.

I appreciate your efforts in this regard,
 - Stephen.