

## Elaine Briere - MVLWB

---

**From:** Brenda Backen [brenda@mvlwb.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 17, 2009 9:29 AM  
**To:** lcarter@mvlwb.com; 'Shannon Hayden - MVLWB'  
**Cc:** 'Anne Umpleby'; permits@mvlwb.com  
**Subject:** FW: Nov 12 and 13th pdf files  
**Attachments:** MVLWB-CITYOFY-NOV-12-09.pdf; MVLWB-TOWNOFHR-NOV-13-09.pdf

Hi Ladies,

I have forwarded this to permits as well!

Cheers!

***Brenda Backen***  
***Manager of Finance & Administration***  
***Mackenzie Valley Land & Water Board***  
***867-669-0506 - P***  
***867-873-6610 - F***  
***867-766-7452 - D***

---

**From:** Wendy Warnock [mailto:warnockw@tscript.com]  
**Sent:** November-15-09 8:46 PM  
**To:** Brenda Backen  
**Subject:** Nov 12 and 13th pdf files

Please note: I corrected 2 spellings in Nov 12 pdf file so replace your old one with this one.

Sorry for the trouble

Cheers!

Wendy Warnock, CEO  
Digi-Tran Inc.  
101 Royal Birch View NW  
Calgary, Alberta T3G 5J9  
1-800-663-4915 or 403-276-7611  
[www.tscript.com](http://www.tscript.com)

**"When you Talk - we Listen!**

***"Teamwork makes the Dream WORK!"***

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MACKENZIE VALLEY LAND AND WATER BOARD

TECHNICAL MEETING

CITY OF YELLOWKNIFE

TYPE A WATER LICENCE APPLICATION FOR CITY OF YELLOWKNIFE

Facilitator:

Lynn Carter

MVLWB

HELD AT:

Yellowknife, NT

November 12, 2009

Day 1 of 1

APPEARANCES

1  
2  
3 Lynn Carter ) MVLWB  
4 Adrian Paradis )  
5 Luke Novy )  
6 Lynn Carter )  
7 Anne Umpleby )  
8 Shannon Hayden )  
9  
10 Dennis Kefalas ) City of Yellowknife  
11 Wendy Alexander )  
12 Chris Greencorn )  
13  
14 Robert Jenkins ) INAC  
15 Jeanne Arsenault )  
16 Scott Stewart )  
17  
18 Danielle De Fields ) North Slave Metis Alliance  
19  
20 Todd Slack ) YKDFN  
21  
22 Jane FitzGerald ) Environment Canada  
23  
24  
25

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
		Page No.
1		
2		
3	List of Commitments	4
4		
5	Opening Comments	5
6		
7	Presentation by City of Yellowknife	9
8	re Water Licence Application Overview	
9		
10	Question Period	18
11	re: Fiddlers Lagoon	27
12	re: Solid Waste Facility	47
13	re: Storm Water	79
14	re: Management Plans	82
15		
16		
17		
18	Certificate of Transcript	97
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	COMMITMENTS		
	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1			
2			
3	1	To advise if the City sees a need to	
4		predict the treatment of phosphorous	
5		within a biological treatment model.	
6		If no, why not. If yes, what would be	
7		the main sources and reasons for	
8		phosphorous that are captured in the	
9		biological model	39
10	2	For City of Yellowknife to provide an	
11		explanation with regards to the	
12		calibration how it considers seasonal	
13		variations in ammonia treatment	40
14	3	INAC to provide rationale in November	
15		27th intervention for recommendation	
16		to move one (1) of the SNP locations	51
17	4	City of Yellowknife to provide specific	
18		reference as to where information is	
19		provided with respect to the discharge	
20		location of the contaminated water that's	
21		been treated and what water quality limits	
22		are associated with that.	61
23	5	City of Yellowknife to provide a copy	
24		of the letter re Transport Canada	71
25			

1 --- Upon Commencing at 9:09 a.m.

2

3 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Well I'll  
4 just -- I'll just start. I think most everyone's here  
5 that I'm expecting. I'd like to say thanks to everyone  
6 for coming out this morning. I'll just take a minute  
7 here to introduce myself. My name is Lynn Carter. I'm  
8 the RO for this file.

9 I took over from Valerie Meers (phonetic),  
10 who -- who was doing this at the beginning, who started  
11 working on this file during the summer. I've been with  
12 the Board before, from 2005 to 2007, so I maybe look a  
13 bit familiar to some of you, and some of you guys look  
14 familiar to me. Just a couple of notes, the washrooms  
15 are out the door.

16 I think most of us has -- have been here  
17 before, but there's emergency exits in the hallways  
18 there. Just follow the signs if something unforeseen  
19 does happen. And we're also going to have a few breaks,  
20 which we'll have some refreshments - feel free to help  
21 yourself back there. And also I just wanted to say, just  
22 watch yourself when you're -- when you're walking,  
23 because we do have some cords here, and that's -- that's  
24 -- we certainly don't want anyone to trip on their way to  
25 the snack table.

1                   So the main purpose of this meeting today  
2 is to talk about the technical issues involved with this  
3 application as much as possible in an attempt to resolve  
4 these prior to the Hearing, and that's -- that will  
5 hopefully shorten the Hearing and make the Hearing run  
6 more efficiently.

7                   I'll just give you a brief update on -- on  
8 this file. Last week the Board made the decision to  
9 exempt this application from preliminary screening. I  
10 think most of you have received that Notice. Let me know  
11 if you haven't.

12                   Also, and I know we're getting kind of  
13 tired of this, but we've made some changes to the draft  
14 work plan for the City. I haven't sent that around yet.  
15 There's hard copies up at the edge of the table there,  
16 and I will be sending it around once I get back to the  
17 office today. But, some of those changes are -- I'll  
18 just go through them very briefly here: written  
19 interventions are now due on November 27th. So we've  
20 allowed a bit more time there.

21                   And then we've changed some of the dates  
22 after Christmas. Just take note of that, that the final  
23 argument -- sorry, the Proponent's response to  
24 interventions is due on January 7th now, and then the  
25 Hearing presentations and intervention Information

1 Requests are due on January 12th. And we had to do that  
2 because we -- we didn't allow for the fact that people  
3 want New Year's Day off, and there's also a weekend in  
4 there.

5                   So just -- I'll give you a bit of an idea  
6 of what's coming up, I guess, November 27th, again, your  
7 written interventions are due. That is -- interventions  
8 are to -- to list your concerns, to -- to make it known  
9 your concerns. And I'm going to make a recommendation  
10 here that if you are listing concerns, that you provide  
11 recommendations to go with your comments.

12                   After the 27th, the next date to note is  
13 the 15th, December 15th, when there will be a pre-hearing  
14 conference. And I'll be sending around more information  
15 about where and when that is going to occur. And then  
16 the Hearing, we've determined a location. The Hearing  
17 will be January 19th and 20th, 2010, at the Explorer  
18 Hotel.

19                   I would also recommend that for those of  
20 you who aren't familiar with our Rules of Procedure for  
21 Hearings, that you review those prior to the Hearing.  
22 And I -- once again, I have hard copies at the front of  
23 the table, and those are also available on our website.

24                   So for today what I tried to do was -- for  
25 the agenda for today, tried to break it out into the main

1 topics of concern. I realize there's a bit of overlap in  
2 there, but we'll try to follow that as much as we can.  
3 Just note that -- I mean the agenda says we'll take the  
4 whole day, but we may not. So, we'll move through these  
5 as -- as quickly as we can.

6 And if we finish one before the allocated  
7 time, we will -- we'll just keep going on to the next  
8 one. So I'm going to -- how it's going to work is the  
9 applicant will give a -- a presentation of their overall  
10 application, and then they'll present, very briefly, on  
11 each of the main topics.

12 And then we will open it up to questions  
13 from the parties around the table, and then to our -- the  
14 Board's consultant. That said, I think I'll do a round  
15 of introductions here. And I'll start with Adrian.

16 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Hello, my name is  
17 Adrian Paradis. I'm a technical consultant to the Board.

18 MR. LUKE NOVY: Hi, my name's Luke Novy,  
19 technical consultant for the Board.

20 MR. SCOTT STEWART: I'm Scott Stewart,  
21 I'm the water licence inspector for Indian Northern  
22 Affairs.

23 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald,  
24 Environment Canada.

25 MS. DANIELLE DE FIELDS: Danielle De

1 Fields, biologist, with North Slave Metis Alliance.

2 MS. JEANNE ARSENAULT: Jeanne Arsenault,  
3 Water Resources, INAC.

4 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Robert Jenkins,  
5 Water Resources, INAC.

6 MR. TODD SLACK: Todd Slack, YKDFN.

7 MR. CHRIS GREENCORN: Chris Greencorn,  
8 Manager of Public Works and Engineering for the City.

9 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: Wendy Alexander, an  
10 engineer with the City of Yellowknife.

11 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas,  
12 Director of Public Works for City of Yellowknife.

13 MS. SHANNON HAYDEN: Shannon Hayden, with  
14 the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board.

15 MS. ANNE UMPLEBY: Anne Umpleby with the  
16 Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. That's great.  
18 One (1) thing that -- that I did forget, is I'm just  
19 going to remind you that this meeting is being recorded,  
20 so please state your name before you begin speaking.

21 Okay, Dennis, I'll turn it over to you.

22

23 PRESENTATION BY CITY OF YELLOWKNIFE RE: OVERVIEW

24 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Thanks, Lynn. We'll  
25 make a presentation, and we invite questions as we go

1 along. It might be easier than waiting to the end. So  
2 with that, I'll get started. Dennis Kefalas, City of  
3 Yellowknife.

4                   Essentially, our outline will be covering  
5 in the water, sewage, solid waste, stormwater, and  
6 additional water licence amendments that we will be  
7 requesting. Essentially, where does our water come from?  
8 We actually have to pump water from Yellowknife River  
9 through an eight kilometre pipeline to pump house number  
10 1, where it's then distributed throughout the City.

11                   The reason we had to do this is during the  
12 late '70s there were concerns regarding arsenic entering  
13 the bay water, where the City used to draw from. And to  
14 alleviate, I guess, the public concerns, a pipeline was  
15 installed and it's maintained by the City.

16                   As you can see, here's the pipeline, eight  
17 kilometres, pumphouse number 1. Distributed throughout  
18 the rest of the City through various pumphouses. Since  
19 our last application we've actually installed a new  
20 research station in the Niven Lake area - research  
21 station number 6. It also preheats our water throughout  
22 this area and allows for us to maintain fire flows in  
23 case of an emergency.

24                   Water Treatment. Currently, you'll see  
25 it doesn't really treat our water, we just chlorinate,

1 and we have flor -- flor -- fluoridation. All water  
2 facilities are monit -- monitored electronically and tied  
3 into pumphouse number 1, and we have an operator 24/7 in  
4 terms of ensuring our system continuously runs.

5           Being in the north, we have -- we deal  
6 with harsh, a very harsh climate, and part of our  
7 requirements is to ensure the water is continuously  
8 circulating. And during the winter months we have to  
9 temper our water to ensure it doesn't freeze within the  
10 distribution system.

11           The City in 2008, we've used almost three  
12 thou -- three (3) -- 3 million cubic metres of water;  
13 that averages out to be 400 litres per person per day.  
14 This is down significantly from the early '90s when it  
15 was around six hundred thou -- 600 litres per person per  
16 day. That was overall use, and that included bleeders  
17 that were part of the system, and they were used as part  
18 of the mate -- mechanism, to ensure our system didn't  
19 freeze especially during the services in -- in certain  
20 homes and individual residence and larger buildings.

21           As you can see from this graph, we've  
22 actually had a reduction. As population has gone up, our  
23 overall consumption has actually gone down. And this is  
24 mainly with our water conservation plan where we do  
25 include leak detection on an annual basis. And as such,

1 we ensure that we try and fix and maintain our  
2 distribution system as thoroughly as possible.

3           In some cases, though, we do have to  
4 install system bleeders in various areas of new  
5 development where we can't complete the loop, so the  
6 water's continuously circulating. And in order to --  
7 until that time we have to install bleeders to allow --  
8 ensure the water doesn't freeze during the winter months.

9           If I'm going to fast just let me -- just  
10 let me know, and slow me down. Future use, the city is  
11 planning on building a water treatment plant to actually  
12 ha -- to actually start filtering our water. In the past  
13 we've conducted two (2) pilot projects to determine the  
14 best filtration process for the city. Within the past  
15 week we've actually reviewed proposals for the actual  
16 detail design of the water treatment plant. And we  
17 should be awarding a contract within the very near  
18 future. Hopefully, before Christmas.

19           Summary. Our wat -- our raw water is  
20 treated. Essentially, it's a very good quality of water,  
21 probably the best in all of Canada. We continue to  
22 upgrade our water infrastructure. Every year we actually  
23 include part of our capital programs, CMP replace them,  
24 which is corrugated metal pipe, sewer lines that need to  
25 be replaced. So every year we've actually put in about 2

1 to \$3 million a year in capital projects to upgrade our  
2 system.

3                   The City is currently experiencing an  
4 infrastructure gap of approximately \$61 million. This  
5 can be contributed to several factor, including the  
6 increased costs of construction, and our reduction in  
7 actual funding in some of our capital projects. The City  
8 is trying to put plans in place now to address this gap,  
9 and to ensure that our future residents won't have to  
10 deal with it in a -- in a -- in a -- some sort of major  
11 capacity in terms of increase in taxes to the point where  
12 it's unaffordable to live in the city.

13                   Overall usage of water the past ten (10)  
14 years has been constant despite the rising population.  
15 And this can be contributed -- or attributed to the fact  
16 that we're actually going through our system and trying  
17 to eliminate bleeders as -- as quickly as possible.

18                   This year alone we've had a capital  
19 project. We were trying to eliminate forty (40) -- or  
20 actually thirty (30) residential bleeders that were part  
21 of the servicing program, where individuals -- the  
22 residential services actually failed, and we had to  
23 install bleeders to enu -- to ensure the water is  
24 continuously running. That project cost us half a  
25 million dollars, so hopefully we'll try and -- in the

1 next few years, address all the residential bleeders to  
2 eliminate them all.

3 Sewage. Where does our sewage go? Well,  
4 we have pipe -- like a gravity system throughout the  
5 city, and a series of lift stations. Once it enters the  
6 main lift station in pumphouse 1 -- or lift station  
7 number 1 is actually pumped towards lift station 5, and  
8 then through a -- a force main to Fiddler's Lake Lagoon.

9 Part of our City is -- I'm not sure all of  
10 you know, we do have a truck system throughout a good --  
11 not a good portion of the City, but a third of a portion  
12 of our City, in terms of Latham Island, Old Town, and the  
13 cabin lake area. So again, we have to have dump stations  
14 for the sewage pickup.

15 And also there's about seven (7) or eight  
16 (8) residents that are still on honey bags. The City's  
17 currently in the process of trying to come up with a  
18 solution to address this so that we no longer have to  
19 provide the service. And one (1) option's actually  
20 supplying composting to all these City residents, so we  
21 won't have to deal with this in the future.

22 We did have a honey bag pit located out at  
23 the Fiddler's Lake Lagoon, and we still do, but it used  
24 to be open to the general public, but we found that  
25 there's a lot of illegal dumping going on, so we've

1 actually closed that of, and installed a bin out at the  
2 landfill where all honey bags are actually deposited in  
3 there, and then once that starts to -- on a weekly basis  
4 is brought out to our honey bag pit out at the lagoon.  
5 We find that we have better control of this, and actually  
6 maintain it to the satisfaction of our inspector.

7                   Since our last water licence renewal,  
8 we've actually had to install two (2) new lift stations  
9 in -- throughout the -- the Niven Lake subdivision area;  
10 that's lift station 10 and lift station number 11. What  
11 we're trying to do -- well actually, what we are in the  
12 process of doing is ensuring that we have backup power  
13 for all our lift stations. This will eliminate the  
14 possibility of any sort of sewage overflows or, actually,  
15 I guess what you call it, sewage spills.

16                   And what we've done is we actually  
17 installed -- lift station number 1 has its own backup  
18 power system, number 10 has a backup power system that's  
19 tied into the Brewster station; that was just recently  
20 installed. The plan is to ensure that all lift stations  
21 have backup power, and hopefully within the next three  
22 (3) to four (4) years that will be accomplished.

23                   I mean, we have to work within our budgets  
24 and we'd -- we'd like to do it all in one (1) year, but  
25 we financially can't do it. So what we've done is put a

1 program in place, and every year we're installing at  
2 least one (1) backup power system.

3 Sewage Treatment. It's a natural  
4 treatment through our -- it's retained in a lagoon for  
5 approximately about nine and a half (9 1/2) months. And  
6 then it makes its way through a series of wetlands and  
7 streams, and smaller lakes and ponds before it discharges  
8 into Great Slave Lake.

9 This is -- the whole system, I guess, is  
10 really about 13 kilometres long. And to date we've been  
11 in -- we've been in conformance with all our water  
12 licence, I guess, criteria. As you can see, it appears  
13 the City itself makes it way through the force main into  
14 the chain of lakes. Fiddler's Lake Lagoon, here's where  
15 the honey bag gets through the decant structure, which is  
16 -- usually decants in the late fall, and it -- we  
17 actually decant for about two (2) months, and it makes it  
18 way through a series of ponds and lakes as it makes its  
19 way through Great Slave Lake down here.

20 Our conformance point is right here, F3.  
21 Or sorry, right here. Sampling occurs on a monthly or is  
22 it weekly basis during decant, and a monthly basis during  
23 non-decant months. So it's part of our program, and to  
24 date we haven't really run into any problems with the  
25 system the way it's operating.

1                   Sewage capacity is about -- retention  
2 about seven and a half (7 1/2) months; that's what it was  
3 designed for. Right now we have nine (9) months in  
4 decant period, as I said. Sew -- as sewage production  
5 increases, retention time will decrease. We've found in  
6 the last few years that we've actually -- by the  
7 elimination of these bleeders, we haven't had any over --  
8 this year we had an overflow problem, or early overflow,  
9 probably due to all the rain that we experienced this  
10 summer which was an extremely wet summer.

11                   Before that, there was three (3) years  
12 where we were actually decanted on time. We found that  
13 by eliminating these bleeders we've actually had an  
14 impact on the capacity of our resi -- of our -- of our  
15 lagoon. And based on the new CCME we -- we expect that  
16 the existing system will meet any future requirements.

17                   Water Licence Amendments. We're looking  
18 at toxicity, reduced percentage of survival of organisms  
19 from 100 percent. Right now we've achieved the 100  
20 percent criteria. But our CCME Guidelines says that  
21 waste water strategy allows for 50 percent mortality  
22 rate. The City is looking to -- well, to try to  
23 establish a rate between 50 percent and 90 percent, based  
24 on discussions with the Board.

25                   Samplings have been reduced to twice a

1 year, once during spring freshet, once during the decant  
2 period.

3 Ammonia. Current licence required a plan  
4 to be put in place to reduce ammonia concentrations to an  
5 average of 5 milligrams per litre for total ammonia, and  
6 10 milligrams for a grab sample.

7 As ammonia toxicities depend on water  
8 temperature and pH, higher levels of ammonia are not  
9 necessarily toxic. As you can see the graph here, I mean  
10 as long as we fall within this cat -- this area, then we  
11 should be fine.

12 What we're recommending is a 15 milligram  
13 per litre average total concentration, a 20 milligram  
14 maximum grab sample concentration, such that  
15 concentrations compared to pH ensure effluent is non-  
16 toxic; will allow for higher ammonia concentrations at  
17 lower pH levels, which is the exis -- existing situation.

18 Phosphorus. Current licence required a  
19 plan to be put in place to reduce phosphorus  
20 concentrations to an average of 1 milligram per litre for  
21 total phosphorus, and a maximum of 2 milligrams for grab  
22 sample. As phosphorus is a site specific concern, the  
23 City recommends performing a full year effluent  
24 characterization, following which phosphorus  
25 concentration levels will be determined. So we're

1 hoping to do that within the first year of the licence  
2 renewal.

3 Existing lagoon is able to produce an  
4 effluent that meets the CCME Waste Water Strategy  
5 Guidelines. Changes to tox -- toxicity testing, and  
6 ammonia and phosphorus concentration requirements will  
7 bring the effluent quality in line with the CCME  
8 guidelines. Now, since this is a -- a national standard,  
9 we're hoping that it will be applied to the City of  
10 Yellowknife.

11 Solid Waste Facility. Existing solid  
12 waste facility is operated as an engineered sanitary  
13 landfill. Waste is baled before its entering the  
14 landfill. We found that by doing this we can maximize  
15 compaction, and extend the life -- the life cycle of our  
16 existing landfill.

17 Right now we do have a -- a very extensive  
18 separation system in terms of trying to separate as much  
19 recycled material as possible. And you'll find that in  
20 the area, we've allowed for reclamation areas for paint,  
21 batteries, white goods, construction waste, glass. No  
22 one really uses glass. We're looking at the possibility  
23 of using glass as a sort of backfill material.

24 What we've done this year is actually  
25 installed a -- we're in the process of installing a three

1 (3) cell salvaging system in order to better control  
2 salvaging at the landfill, and allow residents to  
3 continue a practice that's been in place for many, many  
4 years.

5 But what we found in the past is it also  
6 poses a threat to residents, as well as the employees  
7 working at the landfill the way things have been done in  
8 the past. And a perfect example of this is the major  
9 fire we had there this summer which, essentially, started  
10 in the salvage area and -- and while the proof is not --  
11 I mean, what actually happened is a fire started there by  
12 someone being reckless with a cigarette. And while most  
13 of the evidence is buried under 3 or 4 feet of sand,  
14 essentially, that's what happened.

15 So what we've done this year at the  
16 landfill, besides that -- we've also done to the landfill  
17 too is constructed a composting pad for a -- for a pilot  
18 project. And the purpose of that is to see what effect,  
19 or how long it takes to actually develop -- develop a  
20 good product in terms of compost.

21 If this project is successful, the plan is  
22 to actually have a citywide program in terms of  
23 composting, which will help with diversion of material  
24 entering the landfill.

25 Also this year we did an extensive work

1 with Transportation Canada to -- for us, for the City to  
2 be allowed to actually expand, or to actually create a  
3 new cell, as our landfill is coming near the end of its  
4 existing life. The need has arised to create a new cell.

5           What the -- and through all that hard work  
6 the City -- Transportation Canada has actually said that  
7 the wor -- what we've done to date is actually helps them  
8 make a decision to allow us to cont -- to open a new cell  
9 within the adjacent quarry, which will be roughly in this  
10 area.

11           1990 study. Determined the existing  
12 landfill site would reach capacity by 2008. We're in  
13 2009, and we still have a few years left. And this is  
14 really done by -- as we went through our -- or throughout  
15 the whole area we actually mined certain areas where we  
16 could find cover material, and actually deposit garbage  
17 within these areas, so it's helped us extend the  
18 landfill. Because of -- and also implementation of  
19 additional recycling and waste reduction program has also  
20 helped us quite a bit. We now expect the landfill to  
21 reach capacity around 2011.

22           And we're really in the process of  
23 determining a closure plan, and several years ago we said  
24 that we'd actually have a pilot project in terms of  
25 determining what our cover material will be, and that is

1 in -- that has been postponed and will be done this year.  
2 There is a certain area within the landfill in this  
3 general area here, which is completely closed out and  
4 outside the bear fence, and we're hoping to come up with  
5 a -- a sort of a pilot project in terms of capping, in  
6 terms of what we'll use, and that should be able to  
7 monitor the moisture above and below the cap to see what  
8 effect the actual cap will have.

9           The whole -- the reason that this landfill  
10 was actually placed where it was is because of the  
11 potential for expansion to the adjacent quarries or  
12 opening new cells in adjacent quarries.

13           Calculations have shown that once -- as  
14 these quarries actually deplete the rock within them,  
15 there should be enough capacity to -- to meet the city's  
16 needs for the next hundred (100) years and maybe longer  
17 if we continue with our worst -- our waste diversion  
18 programs.

19           Like I said earlier, we've actually got  
20 approval from Transport Canada to open the new cell in  
21 the adjacent quarry. And this year -- well, actually,  
22 hopefully late this year, early next year, we'll be going  
23 out for proposals to -- to retain an engineer to do a  
24 detailed design for us and which will be run by the Board  
25 before proceeding with the next phase.

1                   Solid Waste Facility. The red bear -- the  
2 red line now highlights the land that's actually owned by  
3 the City. That already includes this quarry currently  
4 under operations. The plan would be to actually build  
5 our cells in five -- into -- for the capacity of five (5)  
6 years. This would allow the existing operator to  
7 continue to blast out all this rock and create more  
8 volume for our landfill.

9                   Like I said, we're going to the process of  
10 a design. Design will include liners and leachate  
11 collection as part of the process.

12                   Landfill Drainage. Currently there are  
13 four (4) sampling points around the landfill, which are  
14 sampled twice a year. The actual four (4) points were  
15 located -- or site in locations that would actually allow  
16 us to test the water before it enters in the major water  
17 bodies, fish bearing water bodies around -- around a  
18 landfill.

19                   This one is located near the ski club and,  
20 as you can see by the drainage pattern, most of the water  
21 in this area will come down through here, through a  
22 series of ditches, and cross the highway and make its way  
23 slowly to -- to Great Slave Lake. As such with this one  
24 too, you can see this area. It'll come through this one.  
25 That's where we picked these sampling points.



1 City's storm water management is actually collected  
2 through a series of catch basins, storm sewers, and  
3 directed to various ponds and lakes around the town,  
4 which are really settlement ponds. They're not fish-  
5 bearing ponds or bodies of water. They're very shallow  
6 and tend to freeze to the bottom during winter months.

7                   Our systems, like most systems throughout  
8 North America, are actually designed for a five (5) year  
9 -- a five (5) year event and, as such, everything else  
10 will be captured through a series of overflows through  
11 parks and along the streets where it's actually -- if the  
12 capacity is not there, it'll flow and be actually stored  
13 in the streets until such time as it can drain through  
14 the existing sewage -- storm sewer collection system.

15                   The City has about five hundred and  
16 twenty-nine (529) catch basins, three hundred and fifteen  
17 (315) storm manholes, and over 70 kilometres of storm  
18 sewer pipe.

19                   Here are the areas. You can see how these  
20 areas generate the -- or actually direct the water to  
21 these various lakes and ponds. Range Lake, again, a very  
22 shallow lake. The water's retained there and has a  
23 overflow structure at the end before it makes its way  
24 through a series of ditches into Kam Lake, again, Range  
25 Lake north, directed towards Frame Lake.

1                   We have a control structure here as well,  
2 which allows us to retain the water in here and -- before  
3 and -- and maintain a certain level so it overflows to --  
4 through a series of ditches, and to Niven Lake, again, a  
5 controlled structure, and then it actually makes its way  
6 into Back Bay.

7                   Downtown area, Forest Drive area.  
8 Actually, this area will direct the water into Rat Lake,  
9 and this series of lakes here, enter the system again.  
10 There's a control structure at this end that allows the  
11 water to make its -- and after -- once it starts  
12 overflowing here, it makes its way through a series, to  
13 several outlets that are along Yellowknife Bay.

14                   All of Kam Lake is directed towards Kam  
15 Lake through a series of ditches and culverts. We have  
16 no actual treatment of stormwater currently in place.  
17 Right now, the effluent quality of the stormwater doesn't  
18 warrant a treatment system.

19                   A stormwater management plan was submitted  
20 in December 2008, several years late, but a lot of these  
21 programs that we had to -- working for the City, you  
22 understand that we work within, I guess, a very fixed  
23 budget and sometimes reports have to wait until we can  
24 find the available resource or funding to actually  
25 complete some of these reports.

1                   The plan is to resubmit the plan at the  
2 end of this month, again, trying to include a lot of the  
3 comments that we got from the stakeholders involved.

4                   Summary. 2000 stormwater sample program's  
5 complete. We plan on revising the stormwater management  
6 plan and hopefully submit it by the end of the month.

7                   Water Licence Amendments. We're proposing  
8 to have a fifteen 15 year water licence. It currently  
9 takes two (2) years for the City to prepare the water  
10 licence for a new application. A fifteen (15) licence  
11 would allow more time to be allotted to plans, manuals,  
12 and studies, as required by the Board.

13                   Really, things haven't changed over the  
14 years and we really feel that fifteen (15) years is more  
15 than justified in terms of anticipating what will go on  
16 in the next fifteen (15) years. Essentially, that's it.  
17

18 QUESTION PERIOD RE FIDDLERS LAGOON:

19                   THE FACILITATOR: All right, thanks,  
20 Dennis. I guess I'll open it up now to questions. I  
21 think we'll start with the Fiddlers Lagoon. And, yeah,  
22 if anyone has any questions for Dennis and his team there  
23 about the lagoon, please jump in.

24                   MR. SCOTT STEWART: I guess I can ask a  
25 question. It's Scott Stewart.

1                   The lagoon overflows pretty regularly in  
2 the fall or in -- you say you're confident that capacity  
3 isn't a concern. Isn't the fact that it overflows  
4 evidence that maybe there's a capacity issue?

5                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS:    Like with most  
6 things, you can't design to include what happens  
7 naturally in terms of large rainfalls, excessive snow in  
8 the wintertimes. I mean, if that becomes an issue in the  
9 future, we can deal with it, but before this, it's been  
10 three (3) years since we've had an overflow.

11                   And we were actually -- this year, it  
12 looked it would be a fine year in terms of not  
13 overflowing, and then we had all that heavy rain which  
14 essentially created a problem with overflow but, again,  
15 sampling proves that we're still in conformance with our  
16 -- with the criteria set out in the -- in the water  
17 licence.

18                   MS. SCOTT STEWART:    Aside from pH at F2,  
19 that's the only one that's been -- that's had a problem.  
20 I'm not suggesting that compliance is the issue in terms  
21 of the quality, just as long as it's on the radar that  
22 capacity could become an issue, because if it's happening  
23 every year, then it's not an anomalous event, it -- it's  
24 something that probably needs to be looked at.

25                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS:    And not this year,

1 but last year -- it's either last year or before, we  
2 actually did a complete survey around the -- the lagoon  
3 to see if we did end up increasing the capacity by, I  
4 guess, building up the berms around it, building up the  
5 decant structure to determine what sort of area we'd be  
6 looking at in increased volume.

7                   And when we do have that on hand, and if  
8 it comes -- if we find that -- the same like we do with  
9 our snow removal, we find that if it's -- we try and  
10 monitor how much snow we're getting every year, and we  
11 find some years -- the norm has been one hundred and  
12 fifty (150) centimetres per year, and then, we had about  
13 two (2), or three (3) years where it's close to two  
14 hundred (200).

15                   If we find that -- we're trying to monitor  
16 that to see whether it's just a change of when the snow  
17 is actually falling, or if the accumulation continues to  
18 be, say, close to two hundred (200), then we'll find that  
19 there is an issue.

20                   Again, with rainfall, we tend to keep  
21 track of all that data. And if we find that rain is  
22 becoming an issue, where we're experiencing more and more  
23 rain on an annual basis, then it's not just an anomaly,  
24 but becomes the norm, then we'll be looking at -- I mean,  
25 the first thing -- the probably easiest thing is to

1 increase the capacity of the lagoon, and that, would be  
2 increasing the berms, the decant and to identify the  
3 areas that -- that will start to, I guess, flood once --  
4 if we do tend to do that.

5 MR. SCOTT STEWART: I know that it's  
6 outside the scope of this, but one (1) thing that you  
7 could look at and it would, obviously, have to go through  
8 the Board, is pas -- possibly expanding towards the next  
9 lake, having another control structure. And then, your  
10 capacity is -- is gonna be a lot easier; you're gonna  
11 have a lot more capacity. But, I mean, obviously, that's  
12 not right now, but ...

13 THE FACILITATOR: Anybody else with  
14 questions?

15 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald,  
16 Environment Canada.

17 Just following up on the capacity, I  
18 noticed in the O&M plan for the landfill from the baler,  
19 based on the O&M plan it looked like the -- the liquid  
20 that drained out of the baler, and the sediment that  
21 drained out of the baler, were collected separately.

22 And that sed -- both the liquid and  
23 sediment are being moved to the lagoon, but they seem to  
24 be moved separately. So, I'm just wondering why a  
25 sediment is being to moved to the lagoon, while at the

1 same time, floating mats from the lagoon are being moved  
2 back to the landfill.

3                   So, I'm wondering if that sediment from  
4 the baler couldn't just be added to the landfill, and in  
5 some ways help with the capacity of the lagoon? Because  
6 it's minimal amount, but over twenty (20) years, it might  
7 add up.

8                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Yeah, something  
9 we'll take into consideration. We'll actually test --  
10 start testing the sediment to see why we're actually --  
11 I'm not sure why we had ended up bringing it to the  
12 lagoon, I think it's just because of where it's coming  
13 from. So, we ended up sending it to the lagoon.

14                   We don't actually dump it into the lagoon,  
15 we dump it adjacent to the lagoon; there's a dump area,  
16 so it allows the water to drain out of it, and for it to  
17 dry up and it just sits, like -- just on the edge at --  
18 on the far end, and then any sort of -- as it dries up,  
19 or de-waters itself, I guess, it ends up making that --  
20 makes its way to the lagoon. I think that was the main  
21 reason why it was done. It's not very large amounts,  
22 it's pretty small amounts, but we can look at doing that  
23 as opposed to hauling it out to the lagoon.

24                   MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. Just as  
25 another follow-up question to the lagoon holding --

1 holding capacity. Dillon Consulting report indicated the  
2 three (3) dams were installed, which have increased the  
3 overall height and additional lagoon holding capacity.

4 Have these three (3) been -- three (3)  
5 dams been accounted for in the calculation of the  
6 estimated storage capacity?

7 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Yes, and one (1) of  
8 the dams was actually installed just to ensure that there  
9 wasn't back-flow going into Trappers Lake, I guess,  
10 that's towards the highway. I'll see if I can find it.

11 Where -- there's one (1) dam, right here,  
12 and that's actually more to prevent back-flow into the  
13 series of lakes. And the major dams are -- there --  
14 there's one (1) further downstream that we haven't -- I  
15 guess, we'll be monitoring it, and actually doing an  
16 evaluation to see how it's holding up. And the major dam  
17 is -- is right where the decant structure itself is, but  
18 all that's been includ -- has been included in the -- in  
19 determining the capacity of the sewage lagoon.

20 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke -- Luke Novy. So,  
21 just to clarify because you mention that there's -- there  
22 was a survey that was conducted for future struc --  
23 future structures to increase it even more.

24 Are these -- these three (3) dams, are  
25 they included in that, or have they already been

1 constructed?

2 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Well, the dams  
3 actually, would be -- like, that was the whole idea of  
4 the survey was actually we want -- but it was going,  
5 actually right around the lagoon itself to determine  
6 where the rock outcrops were, which were natural, I  
7 guess, obstructions for overflow. And part of it would  
8 be how much those existing dams would have to be, I  
9 guess, modified in -- in order to incorporate the  
10 additional capacity.

11 So the whole idea was to determine areas  
12 that we might have to install new dams, new berms, as  
13 well as the areas where we have to modify the existing  
14 dams and berms to increase capacity.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 THE FACILITATOR: Anyone else? Luke, you  
19 can --

20 MR. LUKE NOVY: Okay -- no --

21 THE FACILITATOR: -- just -

22 MR. LUKE NOVY: -- Jane.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Oh, sorry, Jane...?

24 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Oh, no, I didn't  
25 have a capacity question, I was going to move on to the

1 ammonia, so.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Sure, go ahead.

3 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Okay. Environment  
4 Canada had some concerns about the -- their request for  
5 the increase in ammonia. Well, it is true. The -- the  
6 goal is to be non-toxic, that's completely the point.  
7 But we did notice that sometimes, particularly in the  
8 fall, there are some spikes in the pH, we're looking F3.  
9 So there are some concerns with raising the ammonia to  
10 fifteen (15). And particularly when we're looking at  
11 these, I don't see it going up that high very often. I  
12 don't see it very often going above five (5).

13 So I'm not quite sure why such -- why an  
14 increase to fifteen (15) is being requested when -- when  
15 -- I just don't -- it just doesn't seem to be going above  
16 five (5) that often.

17 So my concern is if -- if it is allowed to  
18 go up to fifteen (15) and then we have a pH spike in the  
19 fall, how will this be incorporated and to make sure that  
20 it's still non-toxic coming out of it?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: Wendy Alexander,  
25 City of Yellowknife.

1                   We're asking for the increase in those  
2 concentrations mainly because we've noticed that at lower  
3 pHs we tend to have higher ammonia contents or  
4 concentrations so. But when we'd have higher pHs, we  
5 have quite low ammonia concentrations. So, it was sort  
6 of overall just so that we would be in compliance with  
7 all of the requirements so that our -- our effluent is  
8 non-toxic. So at high pH we have very little ammonia,  
9 which is what we see now, and at low pH we may be able to  
10 have a higher concentration of ammonia because it's still  
11 non-toxic.

12                   So that's why we were asking for the  
13 increase in the concentrations was to cover when we have  
14 low pH in the system.

15  
16                   (BRIEF PAUSE)

17  
18                   MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald. I  
19 had another question about the phosphorous. You were  
20 going to do the one (1) year characterization, which  
21 sounds great, to look at the phosphorous concentrations,  
22 and I'm just wondering if this characterization will be  
23 done for a year, will there be any plans in place to --  
24 if there is a problem, to -- to look at how it can be  
25 dealt with?

1                   Is that something that will be considered  
2 while the characterization is undergoing?

3                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS:   Well, I think as  
4 we're doing the characterization and if we start seeing  
5 there's a problem, we'll definitely approach the Board to  
6 determine what can be done.

7                   And there has to be an understanding,  
8 though, like, given that we're -- our -- our budgets are  
9 so -- we have very tight budgets. I mean, every year we  
10 have to go through a whole budget process and get  
11 ratepayer approval and the whole bit, but the  
12 understanding that we just might not be able to react  
13 immediately.

14                   But during that year if we find a problem,  
15 we'll definitely be approaching the Board and trying to  
16 work out something to see how significant the problem is  
17 and what can be done in order to alleviate the problem.

18                   I mean, that's what the City has always  
19 done and -- and we look out for the best interests of our  
20 -- of this -- of our residents and the surrounding  
21 environment.

22                   So, it will be something we'll definitely  
23 work towards as a partnership with the Board to ensure  
24 that we do meet any -- we can address any issues that  
25 might arise. I'm not sure I answered your question.

1 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: I think you did.  
2 So you mean, like, if there is a problem identified,  
3 you'd develop a work plan to be able to develop a time  
4 line to --

5 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Yeah, and a time  
6 line --

7 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: -- adopt that?

8 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: -- associated with  
9 it, just, you know, to try and work within our -- what we  
10 find working at the City is you have to be somewhat  
11 patient, like, we'll get things done, it's just when  
12 we'll get them done, and we have to try --

13 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Mm-hm.

14 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: -- and fit it within  
15 our existing budgets.

16 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Okay.

17 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: And it's very hard  
18 for us to go get extra money.

19 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. Phosphorous  
20 measurements collected along the lagoon were larger than  
21 raw sewage measurements.

22 Could the City of Yellowknife provide  
23 clarity on why the concentrations of total phosphorous in  
24 the raw sewage were less than in the lagoon?

25 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: I think what you're

1 talking was that one (1) of our sampling points down near  
2 the outside the lagoon itself.

3 MR. LUKE NOVY: This is in reference to a  
4 Dillon Consulting report, that they took measurements at  
5 lift station 5 for raw sewage, and then along the lagoon  
6 on two (2) dates, of July 24th and August 14th, I  
7 believe.

8 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Algae. I guess, as  
9 algae builds up in the lagoon, then it'll increase the  
10 phosphorous levels. And at lift station 5 there's no  
11 algae or anything else. I mean, it's just pure raw  
12 sewage that's been part of -- collected as part of the  
13 collection system.

14 MR. LUKE NOVY: Along the same lines with  
15 phosphorous, the City indicated the treatment options for  
16 reducing phosphorous is the number one priority.

17 Does the City see a need to predict the  
18 treatment of phosphorous within a biological treatment  
19 model? If no, why not? If yes, what would be the main  
20 sources and things for phosphorous that are captured in  
21 the biotra -- biological model?

22 THE FACILITATOR: Can I just take a  
23 minute and remind you guys to say your name before you  
24 speak, please? Thanks.

25 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: We can take that

1 under -- Dennis Kefalas, City of Yellowknife. Can we  
2 take that under advisement and get back to you on that  
3 one?

4 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, for sure.

5  
6 --- COMMITMENT NO. 1: To advise if the City sees a  
7 need to predict the treatment  
8 of phosphorous within a  
9 biological treatment model.  
10 If no, why not. If yes, what  
11 would be the main sources and  
12 reasons for phosphorous that  
13 are captured in the  
14 biological model

15  
16 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. Just also  
17 another question about the biological model. It was  
18 stated that ammonia treatment is a highly temperature  
19 sensitive process.

20 Could the City of Yellowknife provide an  
21 explanation with regards to the calibration how it  
22 considers seasonal variations in ammonia treatment?

23 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, City  
24 of Yellowknife. Again, we'll take that under advisement  
25 and get back to you on that one too.

1 --- COMMITMENT NO. 2: For City of Yellowknife to  
2 provide an explanation with  
3 regards to the calibration  
4 how it considers seasonal  
5 variations in ammonia  
6 treatment  
7

8 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. The  
9 preliminary design parameters and cost estimates were  
10 provided for an all-season four (4) stage waste  
11 pretreatment system. The study indicated a further study  
12 of wetland performance during cold weather and  
13 construction of a pretreatm -- pretreatment system.

14 When does the City of Yellowknife  
15 anticipate completion of a detailed engineering desern --  
16 design report for the lagoon and would the engineering  
17 design report include specific details on the  
18 pretreatment system, pilot study, and the wet -- wetland  
19 performance during cold weather?

20 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Everything that  
21 you're asking there is based on what was in that report  
22 from Dillon, anticipating that there would be a need for  
23 sewage treatment. Right now, given the new CCME  
24 guidelines, we don't feel there is a need for any sort of  
25 additional treatment in other than in the lagoon, so,

1 unless things change dramatically, the City won't be  
2 proceeding with some of the recommendations in that  
3 report.

4 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald.

5 How long does the City anticipate the  
6 lagoon will function as designed right now -- I mean,  
7 continue to meet CCME? Will -- and I guess it could be a  
8 long time, but will studies be done to verify that it is  
9 still working and estimate how long so that there'll be  
10 enough time to react should there be an anticipated  
11 problem in the future?

12 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Well, part of our  
13 monitoring program will help us to determine if there is  
14 a future problem. Also, right now, the City's considered  
15 low risk in terms of -- we don't much processing going on  
16 in town, no -- essentially, none at all.

17 What we plan on doing though is, as  
18 development occurs, if there's any significant changes in  
19 development of the town or City, we'll be requiring that  
20 any new processing plants or manufacturing plants will  
21 actually be doing a treatment onsite before they actually  
22 discharge into our collection system.

23 And that is part of our plan, to try and  
24 reduce the -- I guess, the burden on the taxpayer in  
25 terms of not requiring a sewage treatment plant. But,

1 again, you know, part of our capital plan is every -- we  
2 have ten (10) and twenty (20) years.

3 I mean there is -- you know, originally we  
4 anticipated that within twenty (20) years we'd probably  
5 need a mechanical treatment plant. Right now with the  
6 new CCME guidelines, it doesn't appear that we will.

7 However, as time progresses and if we do  
8 find a need and we ter -- determine that the City is  
9 growing to such an extent that the capacity of the  
10 lagoon, a treatment lagoon, can no longer meet the  
11 criteria, then -- I mean, that won't just happen  
12 overnight. That -- that'll be a transition over many  
13 years. At that time we'll start putting it back into the  
14 program and determine what the best process is in order -  
15 - that -- required to treat our -- our sewage.

16 And again, if it becomes a mechanical  
17 treatment, then that's what will be -- what'll eventually  
18 be installed, designed and installed.

19 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: I just had one (1)  
20 more question. We were happy to -- or Jane Fitzgerald.

21 We were happy to see that the City was  
22 going to be developing an operation and maintenance  
23 manual for the sewage lagoon. We just had some concerns  
24 about the -- the request for twenty-four (24) months  
25 following the issuance of the licence. It just seems

1 like two (2) years is a really long time to be without an  
2 O&M plan, and we were wondering if it's possible if that  
3 could be shortened?

4 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Right now, like we  
5 have everything kind of in place type thing. Like, we do  
6 a lot of it already. It's just putting it all down on  
7 paper.

8 What the City did this year too was  
9 actually hired a consultant to do an operational review  
10 of the Public Works Department. They found that there is  
11 some efficiencies that we can achieve, so in 2010 we plan  
12 on hiring a consultant again to help us put up what we  
13 call a management operation system into place.

14 So we want to be able to complete that  
15 first and then -- because there might be some changes  
16 within our -- the way we operate currently. And that  
17 way, once we get that complete then we can actually do --  
18 put together the O&M plan for the lagoon based on what  
19 come out of this management operating system. And that's  
20 why we wanted to not do it the first year, because we  
21 figured if we do it the first year there might be some  
22 changes to it or significant changes to it before,  
23 because we hadn't conducted our -- the next phase of our  
24 management operating system, our implementation of that,  
25 if that might -- so that's -- we want to do one (1) first

1 and then start with the second one.

2 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. The Dillon  
3 consultant report that was referred to stated that  
4 currently phosphorous limits are portions -- portions of  
5 the time exceeded and they foresee exceedances in the  
6 future.

7 Could the City of Yellowknife clarify the  
8 CCME limits for phosphorous, and if they foresee meeting  
9 these -- these limits in the future, given the current  
10 state of the lagoon and predictions how it would operate  
11 in the future?

12 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: Wendy Alexander.  
13 The CCME doesn't have set limits on phosphorous. It's  
14 all site dependent. So you may have a lake where 1  
15 milligram per litre concentration of phosphorous causes  
16 huge algae blooms and you may end up with another --  
17 another situation where it takes, you know, a hundred  
18 times that before you have any issues in the -- in the  
19 receiving environment.

20 So their suggestion is that you do this  
21 full characterization of your effluent and come up with  
22 site- specific concentrations based on that.

23

24

(BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 THE FACILITATOR: Anybody else?

2 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: It's Robert Jenkins,  
3 from INAC.

4 You mentioned that you are meeting the  
5 CCME criteria now with your effluent. I'm just wondering  
6 at what point you're meeting that criteria. Is it decant  
7 from the lagoon at your Compliance Point F3, F1? Just  
8 wondering what -- where you're actually meeting --  
9 meeting that.

10 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: Wendy Alexander.  
11 We're currently meeting their guidelines at our  
12 Compliance Point F3.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Any other questions?  
14 All right. Well, if that's it for the lagoon, it's about  
15 ten o'clock, why don't we break till about 10:15 and then  
16 come back and start in on the solid waste facility  
17 discussion.

18

19 --- Upon recessing at 10:01 a.m.

20 --- Upon resuming at 10:17 a.m.

21

22 THE FACILITATOR: I'm going to throw it  
23 back over to you, Rob. You had a question for the  
24 Fiddler's Lagoon discussion. Just go ahead.

25 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Yeah, it's Robert

1 Jenkins. Sorry, I thought of a question after we went to  
2 break.

3 I'm wondering if the -- if the City is  
4 requesting a change to its compliance point, its current  
5 compliance point?

6 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: We haven't  
7 specifically stated it, but I guess part of the CCME  
8 guidelines indicates one of the -- like the point should  
9 be a hundred metres downstream from when it enters the  
10 water body. I mean, the way we look at our system -- the  
11 -- is the accepting water body be Great Slave Lake. And  
12 we haven't officially made that request, but that is  
13 something that we was hoping -- hoping was open for  
14 discussion.

15 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Yeah, it's Robert  
16 Jenkins again. Yeah, we'd like to know if -- if you guys  
17 are going to request it because obviously it's a move  
18 downstream. You had mentioned you're currently meeting  
19 those at -- at F3, so we're sort of wondering why, other  
20 than a simple, you know, geographical boundary, why you  
21 would, you know, move it downstream if you're meeting it  
22 at F3. Plus, I guess, it was set at F3 in the past for -  
23 - for a reason, to be protective of the environment  
24 downstream of that, so I guess it's something that, if  
25 you guys decide to request that, we'd be interested in

1 having some discussions with you.

2 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas.

3 Yeah.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Alrighty then, let's  
5 move on to the discussion on the solid waste facility,  
6 and then just jump in here with questions. And I'll just  
7 remind you guys again to state your name before you  
8 speak. Thanks.

9

10 QUESTION PERIOD RE SOLID WASTE FACILITY:

11 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Scott Stewart, Indian  
12 & Northern Affairs. I noticed in your presentation on  
13 the SNP sites there is one (1) of those stations, it's  
14 SNP.32-13, that is currently under the new snow dump, so  
15 it's not really a viable sample site. Just something --  
16 for the next licence, we would probably have to examine a  
17 better place.

18 If -- if a sample site is going to collect  
19 leachate from the landfill, you can't really have another  
20 source of water like a snow dump, so we'd have to move  
21 that site somewhere. And I could do that with -- with  
22 Bruce Underhay or whoever's out at -- at the -- at the  
23 landfill.

24 Just a minor point.

25 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with

1 the City.

2 Scott, do you have any idea where you  
3 might be -- are you looking at any ideas?

4 MR. SCOTT STEWART: I'd have to go out.  
5 I mean, it's -- it's between the -- the quarry and the  
6 landfill. So if I can find a site that's uphill or  
7 something from the snow dump but still captures leachate,  
8 that's what we'd be looking for. Or maybe closer to the  
9 landfill, before the snow dump.

10 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Or closer to the  
11 bear fence?

12 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Yeah, probably.

13 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Would you want to  
14 actually construct something?

15 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Oh -- ahh, you know,  
16 I'm going to have to go and look at the site. I'm not  
17 sure if that would ne -- hopefully that wouldn't be  
18 necessary. It would -- could -- we'd just need to find  
19 an area that's not impacted by the snow dump, that's all.

20 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Okay.

21 MR. LUKE NOVY: It's a good time to ask  
22 this. Luke Novy here.

23 Two (2) snow dump disposal locations, one  
24 (1) used by the City of Yellowknife and the other by  
25 local contractors, was recommended to be discontinued, as

1 it adds moisture to the landfill, which could lead to  
2 leachate generation and migration of leachate away from  
3 the landfill.

4 I just want to have clarification  
5 provided, if either of the -- either of these sites have  
6 been discontinued.

7 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
8 the City. Actually, these -- they've been relocated, so  
9 they don't actually have an impact on the existing  
10 landfill. Before we used to dump the snow up here, which  
11 is part of the landfill. Now it's down here, well below.  
12 If you know the elevations, you could actually see a road  
13 coming in here. It's actually below and outside the area  
14 of the landfill. The other one, it's here. I mean,  
15 that's a fairly new one. Again, we used to do --  
16 actually bring in snow from the city, from the downtown  
17 core, and now we bring it in-between -- in this general  
18 here, between the -- the old -- the existing landfill and  
19 the adjacent quarry.

20 Part of our plan too is to actually maybe,  
21 as the lease runs out on this very far quarry over here,  
22 is actually convert that to a -- to a new snow dump. But  
23 right now, the way it's situ -- situated, we have natural  
24 barriers with rock that actually don't allow the water to  
25 migrate into the landfill.

1 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Dennis -- it's  
2 Adrian Paradis -- can you please show us that -- show us  
3 that on the drainage pathways? On that there's a -- the  
4 same thing -- the same sort of sketch about the drainage.

5 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
6 the City.

7 If we look at this area here, like here's  
8 the landfill perimeter right here. Here's that pond.  
9 This snow dump is actually right in this area here.  
10 That's the contractor's snow dump. And the City snow  
11 dump, this actually goes over the top of this location  
12 here.

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Anyways, you can see  
17 this actually drains -- the water actually drains away  
18 from the landfill in these areas, and actually land --  
19 water from the landfill drains into those areas.

20 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Scott -- Adrian  
21 Paradis. Scott, you'd actually mentioned that one (1) of  
22 the -- a recommendation to actually move one (1) of the  
23 SNP locations. So in your November 27th intervention,  
24 can we have an undertaking or a commitment for INAC to  
25 provide that in writing with a rationale for potential

1 choices. Just --

2 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Yep, sure.

3 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: -- basically, just  
4 breakdown your rationale and -- and make sure --

5 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Yeah.

6 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: -- it's on November  
7 27th.

8 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Yeah, that's fine.

9 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Okay.

10

11 --- COMMITMENT NO. 3: INAC to provide rationale in  
12 November 27th intervention  
13 for recommendation to move  
14 one (1) of the SNP locations

15

16 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. I just had a  
17 further question in relation to the snow disposal.

18 Have any mechanisms been installed that  
19 would prevent the subsurface migration, an addition of  
20 liquid to the landfill?

21 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, City  
22 of Yellowknife.

23 What -- nothing's actually been put in  
24 place, but there are natural barriers. What occurs up  
25 here is you'll find that, as the snow melts, I mean the

1 ground's still frozen underneath it, so you get very  
2 little infiltration during the -- as the snow melts.  
3 You'll find a lot of areas that's like that. The ground  
4 will actually thaw. Sometimes our ground's not thawed  
5 until well into July in certain areas, just because of  
6 the environment that we live in. And we've noticed that  
7 quite a bit throughout our capital replacement program.

8                   And you'll find that, in areas where there  
9 is a large amount of snow built up, on top of that ground  
10 won't be thawed till August.

11                   MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald.

12                   Following up with that, in the drainage  
13 study by Ray Dillon, they made the comment that  
14 significant inter -- indications of leachate migration  
15 have not been detected based on the information provided  
16 as part of the service runoff investigation, and  
17 additional investigations should be pursued to further  
18 investigate subsurface seepage patterns, leachate  
19 characterizations, and integrity of the bedrock.

20                   Will the City be following up on this to  
21 characterize the leachate in the landfill?

22                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Well, we discussed  
23 that with Dillon at the time when they generated the  
24 report. And we actually had a plan in place, that we  
25 actually started drilling holes throughout the garbage,

1 or the areas that were actually landfill areas, to see --  
2 just to confirm what the -- their electromagnetic, I  
3 guess, subsurface model generate, in terms of the rock  
4 profile.

5                   They came back. And I asked them, I said,  
6 Well, how are we going to do the rest of these studies,  
7 and they never had an answer, Because I mean the work  
8 that's entailed, I mean it just can't be done.

9                   Even drilling, the drilling pattern, I  
10 said, We're -- we're prepared to do it. And then they  
11 came back with the idea, said, Well, if we start hitting  
12 cars or anything else that's solid underneath there we  
13 won't be able to get through with the drill rig and it  
14 won't provide any useful information.

15                   No blasting has actually occurred at the  
16 landfill and really no tectonic action has actually  
17 occurred. We're not in an earthquake zone, or anything  
18 like that, so there's nothing to lead us to believe that  
19 there's actually seepage throughout the landfill.

20                   So will there be additional studies? We  
21 can't say how they can be done and if somebody can come  
22 up with a -- a method of how it can be done, I mean we  
23 could look at that. But right now we weren't going to  
24 pursue anything else within the Dillon Report. And based  
25 on conversations with them, they can confirm that they



1 Environment Canada had raised too, particularly that elev  
2 -- elevated arsenic, which is common in this area, and  
3 the need to establish background levels for the area  
4 before we can make comments as to whether the levels  
5 coming out of the landfill are elevated or not, compared  
6 to the background.

7                   The City did make a comment that they  
8 would be following up with this, which we were really  
9 pleased to see. And we just had the quick question as to  
10 -- if the City had any idea of when this follow-up would  
11 be able to occur. But we were, again, very pleased to  
12 see that follow-up will be taken to establish those  
13 background levels so we have a better idea of what's  
14 actually going on.

15                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
16 the City.

17                   We've actually have a consultant,  
18 Biogenie, who's actually treating our hydrocarbon  
19 contaminated soil, as well as hydrocarbon contaminated  
20 water. And we're finding that the -- just the water  
21 coming off the -- that we actually, I guess, retain  
22 within our treatment pond that's out at the lagoon, we'll  
23 find that the elevations of arsenic are slightly higher  
24 than what the existing criteria is. And we're hoping  
25 that they will work on the -- actually do the work within

1 the next coming year, 2010, to try and establish what the  
2 appropriate background elevations should be, and -- and  
3 if any treatments are required base -- base it on this  
4 background elevations within the area.

5           You'll notice that ENR has actually  
6 accepted higher levels for arsenic within soils, based on  
7 specific areas for the City of Yellowknife. And you'll  
8 find that many other jurisdictions where there is ongoing  
9 -- essentially where there's the presence of gold,  
10 there's a presence of arsenic. So hopefully within 2010  
11 we'll try and establish a criteria that is really  
12 appropriate for the City of Yellowknife area.

13           MR. SCOTT STEWART: Sorry, Scott Stewart.

14           So if -- if they do find that the  
15 concentrations in the -- in the leachate are  
16 significantly above background, I guess the City would  
17 have to look at a treatment system. Or, I guess, you  
18 cross that bridge when you get to it, but...

19           MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Well, we'll fi --  
20 you'll find like -- we're hoping to start construction of  
21 a new cell, maybe late 2010, early 2011. Part of that  
22 new design with include a leachate collection and  
23 treatment system. If we find within the next year, like  
24 we set some parameters, and we find they're above those  
25 parameters, we're hoping that this new leachate

1 collection system will be able to be designed to treat --

2 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Arsenic.

3 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: -- arsenic, or any  
4 other sort of minerals that'd be higher, the background  
5 elevations.

6 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Okay. Along the same  
7 lines, I know it's been discussed before, the capacity of  
8 -- of the treatment facility out there is sometimes  
9 overwhelmed with -- with the volume of contaminated soil.

10 Is there -- is there -- are there plans to  
11 expand the pad, or an area set aside to -- to store  
12 contaminated soil that can't be put in the treatment  
13 system?

14 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
15 the City.

16 Actually, Scott, based on our last  
17 conversations, we were just -- continued monitoring how  
18 much soil was coming in. We're finding that all this  
19 pasture quite -- the -- the soil is much more than what  
20 we expected it to be.

21 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Okay.

22 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: And as such we  
23 actually installed a -- the storage area, and we  
24 installed the liner under the storage area.

25 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Oh, you did. Oh, I

1 haven't been out for a --

2 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Yeah --

3 MR. SCOTT STEWART: -- while.

4 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: -- it's just

5 something recent, Scott. Just before the --

6 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Okay.

7 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: -- within the --

8 well, since your inspection, that's when it's actually

9 took --

10 MR. SCOTT STEWART: Okay.

11 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: -- place.

12 MR. SCOTT STEWART: That's great. Good.

13 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Concerning -- oh,

14 sorry, Jane Fitzgerald.

15 Concerning the release of water from the  
16 water treatment lagoon at the landfill, it was noted in  
17 Biogenie's -- let me see, report on the operations of it,  
18 that it's being released to the land and that this  
19 discharge location should absorb the outflow.

20 Have any studies been done to determine  
21 whether or not it actually is absorbing the outfall --  
22 outflow?

23 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Not so much studies,  
24 but just, I guess, visual verification. But you'll find  
25 that last year we actually brought the -- because of --

1 the arsenic concentrations were slightly higher than what  
2 the -- what would allowed for us to discharge the natural  
3 environment, so we actually had the -- the -- we actually  
4 trucked the, I guess, effluent, if you want to call -- or  
5 treated water, to Giant Mine and deposit it in one of the  
6 tailing ponds.

7                   This year we found we ran into the same  
8 problem, whereas it fi -- just -- just a little bit  
9 higher than what the criteria allows, so we're actually  
10 going to retain it. And that's why we're looking at  
11 either increasing the background levels or doing the same  
12 thing, it's actually deposited it in one of the tailing  
13 ponds, which will ele - eventually be treated through the  
14 water-treatment system at Giant Mine.

15                   So right now we're actually contain --  
16 holding on to that water until such time as we can ensure  
17 that it's acceptable to be discharged to the natural  
18 environment, or we'll have to come up with a different  
19 treatment process.

20                   MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald.

21                   So this -- moving the water from the  
22 lagoon to the tailings pond, is that something that's in  
23 the solid waste O&M Plan?

24                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: It's not currently  
25 in the plan, because we thought it'd be a one (1) time, I

1 guess, a one (1) time event. And now it's the second  
2 year, so we'll have to actually put something to --  
3 either into -- like, incorporate it into Biogenie's plan  
4 or into our solid waste plan -- plan which is  
5 essentially, I guess, Biogenie's plan as an appendix to  
6 our existing solid waste management plan.

7 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. I was just  
8 wondering if the City could provide clarification on --  
9 on a -- one (1) of the map -- present maps on the  
10 discharge location of the contaminated water that's been  
11 treated, and also what limits are proposed for the -- for  
12 -- to enable the discharge, what water quality limits are  
13 associated with that?

14 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Actually the Board  
15 has all that information already, and is actually  
16 approved by the Board, in terms of where it's discharged  
17 and the levels of the discharge criteria. We can get you  
18 a copy of everything and a copy of Biogenie's plan.

19 MR. LUKE NOVY: It's this document --  
20 could you provide reference for the document this is  
21 present in? Sorry, Luke Novy.

22 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Sorry, can you  
23 repeat the question, Luke?

24 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. I was just  
25 wondering if I could have the -- the specific reference

1 where this information is provided?

2 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Yeah, we'll provide  
3 that to you, Luke.

4  
5 --- COMMITMENT NO. 4: City of Yellowknife to  
6 provide specific reference as  
7 to where information is  
8 provided with respect to the  
9 discharge location of the  
10 contaminated water that's  
11 been treated and what water  
12 quality limits are associated  
13 with that.

14  
15 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: It's Robert Jenkins  
16 with INAC. I'm just wondering, you mentioned you'd have  
17 additional capacity now for -- for hydrocarbon  
18 contaminated soil.

19 Do you know, I guess, how much more  
20 capacity you have?

21 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: It all depends on  
22 high ho -- how -- how high we actually build the  
23 stockpile. But we've also included a -- the area is  
24 actually, I think, about three (3) times the size of our  
25 pad. Two (2) or three (3) times the size. And actually,

1 we've -- Biogenie's actually purchased a compressor too,  
2 so we'll hopefully be able to treat the soil in a much  
3 more timely manner. And that should be starting -- we've  
4 equipped the site with power and that process should  
5 start in 2010. So hopefully we'll be able to turn over  
6 the hydrocarbon contaminates soil on a much more timely  
7 manner.

8 MR. TODD SLACK: Todd Slack, YKDFN. I  
9 just have a question in regards to the -- the volumes in  
10 the long-term operating. Diavik, for instance, has a  
11 commitment that they made in their EA to -- to take out  
12 all of their solid waste, and I'm sure they view --  
13 sorry, at closure. I'm sure they'll be looking towards  
14 you guys for dumping some of that.

15 Has there been discussions for this, you  
16 know, fifteen (15), twenty (20) years down the road?

17 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Right now our policy  
18 is that if it's on a truck, it stays on a truck and they  
19 can ship it south. What we're looking at, in terms of  
20 landfills becoming a regional landfill -- I mean, this is  
21 internal discussions only, so far.

22 There's no need for Dettah to have its own  
23 landfill. The whole idea now is to hopefully come up  
24 with some sort of agreement with GNWT to allow the City  
25 to become more of a regional landfill, in terms of

1 closing out the landfills for Dettah, and if in the case  
2 -- and if in the future it becomes an issue that Raylo --  
3 Rae Edzo no longer has the capacity to maintain a  
4 landfill, that we'd make allowances for them to come to  
5 the City too.

6 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald.

7 You might have mentioned this in the  
8 presentation, but just for clarification, are the new --  
9 the conversion of the quarry as part of the landfill, is  
10 that included in this Application or that -- or will that  
11 be following this Application?

12 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
13 the City.

14 That will be following this Application.  
15 What you'll see within hopefully the next year is first a  
16 new design for the new cell, and probably shortly, maybe  
17 later in the year, a closure plan for the old landfill,  
18 once we've had a chance to see how our pilot project  
19 worked with our synthetic clay liner. I'm not sure if  
20 anyone knows that but there's very clay within the area,  
21 so we'll have to actually install some sort of liner  
22 system as part of our closure plan.

23 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald.

24 So this closure plan will obviously be submitted to the  
25 Board.

1 Will closure begin after approval of the  
2 plan?

3 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Yes. Well, it'll be  
4 -- it'll be scheduled for closure. I mean, again, we'll  
5 have to provide a schedule to work within our existing  
6 funding. The City currently owns the area where the  
7 landfill is, so it'll be closed in a systematic manner,  
8 and depending on funding how -- we're not sure how long  
9 that will take.

10 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: It's Robert Jenkins,  
11 with INAC. So -- so you'll be submitting a -- what you  
12 would hope to be a final closure plan for the existing  
13 facility, and then for your new facility will you be  
14 submitting a -- a preliminary plan?

15 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: For the new facility  
16 will actually be -- it'll be a detailed design for the  
17 actual construction of a new cell. So it will include  
18 liners. I guess what we'll be doing -- originally it'll  
19 be a liner, a leachate collection system, how we plan to  
20 proceed within the next years in terms of five (5) year  
21 cells. Shortly after that we'll come up with a closure  
22 plan for the existing landfill.

23 And -- and with the anticipation at that  
24 closure plan will also be applied to the existing  
25 landfill, in terms of capping, final capping.

1                   MR. ROBERT JENKINS:    Okay.  It's Robert  
2    Jenkins again.

3                    So you'll be incorporating your new  
4    infrastructure into your closure plans is what you're --  
5    what you're saying?

6                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS:    No, not really.  But  
7    our -- our closure plan into our new landfill, our new  
8    cell.  Does that make more sense?

9                   MR. ROBERT JENKINS:    It's Robert Jenkins,  
10   from INAC.

11                   I guess what I'm -- what I'm trying to get  
12   at is that you guys are going to be doing closure in the  
13   near future on your existing landfill.  So you're going  
14   to submit some sort of detailed closure plan for that in  
15   the near future.

16                   But you've got new infrastructure coming  
17   on line and generally the way that -- one of the things  
18   that we -- INAC supports is sort of having a preliminary  
19   plan which doesn't have the level of detail as a -- as a  
20   final plan.  But there are things that even when you're  
21   at the initiation of -- of something new, things you want  
22   to start thinking about are closure, and it could be  
23   simple as characterizing the site, things like that.  So  
24   that's what I'm sort of wondering how those two (2)  
25   pieces are going to come in.

1                   MR. ADRIAN PARADIS:   Adrian Paradis, for  
2 the Land and Water Board.  Maybe I can try and clarify  
3 part of this too, is underneath the -- underneath the  
4 Act, Section 6(2) -- 6(2)(f) of the Northwest Territories  
5 Water Regulations, requires submission of an abandonment  
6 restoration plan for any new facility.

7                   So despite the fact that -- the hope is  
8 that this facility will be open for the next hundred  
9 years, potentially, there will, or should be, a  
10 requirement for some initial thoughts to be going into  
11 A&R for the site, and, I mean, having some of that  
12 information being developed into the actual construction  
13 design and operations.

14                   So with all that information in -- in  
15 mind, we'll go back to Robert's question.

16                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS:   I will have to say  
17 yes.  But, that -- essentially the closure will be  
18 actually preliminary in nature until we can fin --  
19 finalize the capping details of the existing landfill and  
20 incorporate that into the new one.

21                   MR. LUKE NOVY:    Just a question relating  
22 to the -- to the preliminary design report, and when does  
23 the City see an update to that, and finalization of it,  
24 into a full -- a full engineering design report for the  
25 future landfill?

1 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
2 the City.

3 I think we're anticipating probably the  
4 second quarter of 2010. We should have our RFP up for  
5 the first of the year, a three (3) week turnaround, and a  
6 decision within the first -- within that week or so --  
7 within the first month of the new year.

8 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy.

9 With regards to the compost facility  
10 pilots -- pilot compost facility, could the City then pro  
11 -- provide perspective on the treated soil quality  
12 criteria, and where -- where is the treated soil used or  
13 applied? Additionally, could the City of Yellowknife  
14 provide any details on how water drains away from this  
15 compost facility?

16 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
17 the City. Are we talking the soil treated the comp --  
18 the hydrocarbon pad?

19 MR. LUKE NOVY: As with --

20 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Or just the compost  
21 that's being generated by the pilot project plant?

22 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. Just to  
23 clarify, the soil that's being treated for the compost  
24 pilot study.

25 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: Wendy Alexander,

1 with the City.

2 All of the -- the organics and the car --  
3 the carbon amendments that are going to that compost pad,  
4 the pad is designed, such that any water, et cetera, all  
5 drains into a lin -- lined lagoon that's currently there.  
6 We envision that the compost that's created will be used  
7 for city projects, and it may have commercial aspects as  
8 well.

9 We're -- at this point, we don't  
10 anticipate that there will be a tonne of compost material  
11 generated; that will be very limited, as it is a pilot  
12 project. So it will sort of be used for city projects  
13 first, and then we'll determine if there's any excess  
14 that can be used elsewhere.

15 MR. LUKE NOVY: Are there -- are there  
16 any limits proposed for any of those uses that -- that  
17 the City uses? Luke Novy.

18 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: Wendy Alexander.  
19 Could you elaborate. What do you mean by "limits"?

20 MR. LUKE NOVY: Treatment limits for the  
21 compost organic material that's in there, is there any  
22 criterias that are -- that are established for the use of  
23 this material, as for City projects or other uses?

24 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: The compost that  
25 we're creating, the quality of it, we have to follow

1 guidelines that are set out by the CCME. So, we  
2 anticipate that we are going to have, I believe, it's a -  
3 - I don't know whether it's Grade A, but it's a -- it's a  
4 top quality compost material, which can actually be used  
5 in any soil amendment project. So, it can be used,  
6 literally, anywhere.

7 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. Just one (1)  
8 final question on the compost facility.

9 Does the -- when does the City foresee the  
10 pilot study ending? And also, do they have do you -- is  
11 there any plans to go to a full scale compost facility in  
12 the future?

13 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Well, I anticipate  
14 the project to be about a -- the duration will be one (1)  
15 year. It might be extended beyond that. If we find the  
16 results are favourable, I mean, we'd be presenting it to  
17 Council in terms of trying to initiate a city-wide  
18 project based on available funding.

19 So, what will happen if -- we'll continue  
20 the pilot project, if it is suc -- favourable, until such  
21 time as we can afford to implement city-wide composting  
22 plan. So, it -- minimum one (1) year, maybe max three  
23 (3) years.

24 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Adrian Paradis, for  
25 the Land and Water Board.

1                   Could the City of Yellowknife provide an  
2 update on if -- if any agreements have been made with  
3 Transport Canada -- Canada on the potential new solid  
4 waste facility located in the quarry pits north of the  
5 existing facility?

6                   What's happened is there's been a lot of  
7 material in the papers and some of the news stories but,  
8 to date, the Board has not received any official  
9 notification from either Transport Canada or the City of  
10 Yellowknife on those discussions. And it's just a matter  
11 of coming to an understanding so that we can present it  
12 to the Board.

13                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: All we have is the  
14 letter saying that they don't have any significant -- or  
15 any issues with us opening a new cell in the adjacent  
16 quarry. They had made a stipulation where we should --  
17 our wildlife management plan essentially become part of  
18 what's currently happening at our existing airport, and  
19 vice versa, where both our plans are -- are incorporated  
20 together to ensure that there's ongoing communication  
21 between both -- both, I guess, facilities.

22                   I'm not sure, is there jurisdiction to  
23 actually approve or disprove the -- or approve or not  
24 approve the opening of a new cell? They can just  
25 actually provide their, I guess, what's the word, support

1 for the new cell in terms as long as we maintain the  
2 existing operations, including covering in a timely  
3 manner, reduce edible waste.

4 I mean, based on my understanding, I mean,  
5 we can open a new cell there and it's really -- I don't  
6 think -- the only person that could say whether we can  
7 open a cell or not open a cell would be the Board, and  
8 it's really not Transport Canada. We just want to have  
9 their support in opening a new cell.

10 I don't think we fall within their  
11 jurisdiction in terms of what can and cannot be done  
12 there.

13 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Dennis -- my name's  
14 Adrian Paradis. Dennis, can we get a copy of the -- of  
15 the letter, just for the Board's records? And the Board  
16 will probably have to follow up with Transport Canada  
17 after that just to get some clarification for themselves.

18 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas.  
19 Sure.

20  
21 --- COMMITMENT NO. 5: City of Yellowknife to  
22 provide a copy of the letter  
23 re Transport Canada  
24

25 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy.

1                   Along the same lines with a future  
2 building of the cell at the quarries, I want to clarify  
3 if the City has provided -- has conducted any  
4 hydrogeological or geotechnical characterization for  
5 suitability of that site?

6                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS:   We haven't -- I  
7 mean, other than just discussing with one (1) of our  
8 consultants, we haven't performed any sort of  
9 geotechnical information. I mean, the idea -- the whole  
10 area is essentially granite, volcanic in nature.

11                   I mean, it's been blasted flat or blasted  
12 semi-flat, so the base itself, needless to say, is  
13 probably one of the best to construct any sort of  
14 features on it. As well, the plan is to incorporate a  
15 liner within the system, which will ensure that any  
16 leachate can and will be collected.

17                   We don't foresee any, I guess, need to  
18 conduct studies that won't add anything to the project.

19                   MR. ROBERT JENKINS:   It's Robert Jenkins  
20 with INAC. I mean I agree, if you're going to construct  
21 a liner, you're hopefully going to be catching your  
22 leachate, and then -- and treating it appropriately.

23                   I guess that sort of draws the importance  
24 then of -- of what sort of monitoring or -- or  
25 maintenance schedule you're going to have on your -- on

1 your liner. And I assume you're going to have one?

2 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Well, it'll be all  
3 incorporated into our new landfill design. Yes, we will.  
4 Dennis Kefalas, with the City.

5 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. A feasibility  
6 study of concurrent operations during landfill  
7 construction and operation with the quarry was  
8 recommended in a consulting report.

9 I'm wondering if the City of Yellowknife  
10 expects to be conducting such a study?

11 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: It -- Dennis  
12 Kefalas, with the City. It won't be so much a study, but  
13 an agreement with the adjacent -- or the existing quarry  
14 operator. We've had initial discussions with them in the  
15 plans, and we've actually modified their quarry and lease  
16 permit to ensure that we can maintain joint operations of  
17 the facility.

18 Currently, there are ex -- I guess,  
19 practices in place to ensure that no blasting is  
20 occurring while people are present at the landfill or  
21 when staff are actually there. Before, when there was,  
22 we actually vacated the landfills and made sure everyone  
23 was at a safe distance before any sort of blasting  
24 occurred.

25 Needless to say, the area that will

1 incorporate the new cell will also have been equipped  
2 with a bear fence, which will actually delineate the area  
3 from the quarry.

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. Jumping back  
8 -- jumping -- shift back to the hydro-contaminated soil  
9 and water facility, currently there are no specific  
10 limits for discharge criteria of water from this  
11 facility.

12 And it's a question for the floor. If --  
13 is there a recommendation for any limits, and what  
14 specific types of parameters would that entail?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Adrian Paradis, from  
19 the Land and Water Board.

20 The hydrocarbon contaminated facility was  
21 constructed underneath an approval of a plan versus  
22 actual -- but, it was not an actual amendment of the  
23 licence itself. So, the current operations for that  
24 facility are done through a plan approval, but not  
25 actually appended right into the actual licence.

1                   So, the question is: Should the Board  
2 look at new, or any other criteria, or should they  
3 basically take what was approved of, I think, in 2005,  
4 2004 and just simply cut and paste, and insert into the  
5 actual licence itself, and have it built in?

6                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: I'd have -- Dennis  
7 Kefalas.

8                   I'd have to say, yes, for now, because the  
9 plan is to try and evaluate what the -- especially for  
10 the water -- treated water discharge criteria, and what  
11 that should be.

12                   In terms of the, you know, the background  
13 metals that we discussed earlier, and see if there should  
14 be a different criteria, or a criteria site-specific set  
15 for that. So, essentially, we were gonna -- once we got  
16 the approval of a new water licence, we were gonna start  
17 the -- all the additional work, and look to make  
18 amendments as within the next year, I suppose. And, you  
19 know, to allow us some time to actually study the -- the  
20 issue, and determine what an appropriate solution would  
21 be.

22                   MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Adrian Paradis.  
23 Just a follow up of that is -- the question is still open  
24 to the -- to the rest of the floors, what licence limits  
25 the Board should include. And part of that is, simply,

1 you may not know the information now, and may want to do  
2 it at the November 27th deadline.

3 But, also for the City of Yellowknife it's  
4 -- another question is: What is the plans for the  
5 hydrocarbon contaminated facility with the expansion of  
6 the new -- new location, or is it to keep it at the  
7 existing facility, or is it to transport it over and  
8 build a new location at the other site? And part of this  
9 will then also go into you're a&R plan for closure, and  
10 how you plan on dealing with that?

11 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
12 the City.

13 There's several, I guess, op -- well, I'm  
14 not sure if you'd call them facilities within a facility  
15 but, again, the hydrocarbon contaminated pad, there's no  
16 plans in moving that. The abandonment and restoration  
17 plan for the old landfill will incorporate the continued  
18 existence at the existing location of the hydrocarbon  
19 contaminated treatment facility, as well as our three (3)  
20 cell system. The way it's been constructed, there's no  
21 plans on moving that.

22 And as we expand into adjacent quarries,  
23 the baling facility's not moving. The three (3) cell  
24 system is at its permanent location. We anticipate that  
25 the hydrocarbon contaminated pad is in its permanent

1 location. While we'd be closing out the old landfill,  
2 there would be still -- they'll still form part of our, I  
3 guess, our overall facility. If that makes sense.

4 I mean, it would -- the -- the plan is to  
5 become more of a transfer station, as opposed to, say,  
6 having an open area for residents to visit. But, you  
7 know, improve our recycling, storage of recyclables. And  
8 what we do is create a chain, I guess, a -- a road  
9 network chain to tie into these new land -- new cells.  
10 But, it's potentially just to become one great big  
11 landfill area, and we'll proceed to close out in a  
12 systematic manner.

13 But, several of these, I guess, facilities  
14 within facilities will -- are at their permanent  
15 locations. So, that will be existing, or staying where  
16 it is.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 THE FACILITATOR: Is that it? Are there  
21 any other questions on the landfill?

22 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy.

23 It was indicated in the report that  
24 currently the City of Yellowknife's landfill staff are  
25 responsible for hazardous waste materials.

1 I was wondering if there's any specific  
2 program that is being followed by the City of Yellowknife  
3 staff for the transport disposal of hazardous waste  
4 materials?

5 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
6 the City.

7 We don't really -- well, we accept that  
8 the landfill, essentially, is hydrocarbomic --  
9 hydrocarbon contaminated material: asbestos, used oils,  
10 some paints, but, again, it's a paint reclamation  
11 project. There is a -- twice a year, a ha -- a household  
12 hazardous waste collection, and that's done in  
13 conjunction with ENR. And our staff does have training  
14 in terms of how to properly collect the -- I guess the  
15 household hazardous waste and how to properly put it in  
16 the containers.

17 And I believe it's ENR that actually is  
18 responsible for having that transported south. And this  
19 is a program we hope to continue to offer our residents  
20 in the future and -- and in partnership with ENR of the  
21 GNWT.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Well, if we  
23 don't have anything more on the landfill, let's move into  
24 the stormwater section of the agenda. And, again, I'll  
25 just throw it out there, jump in.

1

2 QUESTION PERIOD RE STORM WATER:

3 MR. LUKE NOVY: It's been indicated --  
4 Luke Novy. It's been indicated that there's erosion  
5 control measures that have been incorporated into  
6 upgrading or retrofitting of existing infrastructure.

7 The question is proposed to the City of  
8 Yellowknife, if there's an overall decision making  
9 process part of an overall plan or is -- if it's being  
10 done on an as- needed basis?

11 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
12 the City.

13 What we try and incorporate is what's --  
14 in terms of erosion and con -- and sediment control, is  
15 we've -- we're in the process of adopting some of the  
16 standards used in the Province of Ontario, which are  
17 probably second to none in terms of specifications for  
18 this in Canada.

19 You'll find that any work that we do near  
20 any sort of discharge areas, our staff will contact  
21 Fisheries and Oceans, as we what -- we do in terms of  
22 major projects, to come with a plan and ensure that there  
23 are -- that they support our plan.

24 So, essentially, it's tri -- it's somewhat  
25 systematic and there is definite minimums of what we'll

1 actually do, in terms of providing some sort of -- I  
2 guess, we have, I guess, silk curtains put up. Actually,  
3 we've actually tried to incorporate other materials too,  
4 including booms, equipped with silk curtains to ensure  
5 that water is not impacted by any sort of ongoing  
6 construction.

7 MR. LUKE NOVY: This is a follow-up --  
8 Luke Novy -- question for that.

9 Would -- would you be -- in terms of  
10 incorporating the standards, would you be relying on them  
11 to dictate -- dictate some erosion protection measures,  
12 or is it more on a consulting with the Department of  
13 Fisheries?

14 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
15 the City.

16 It'll do -- be -- become part of like a  
17 standard for the City, which will be done on every  
18 location. Currently, even at our new field house, we've  
19 -- trying to become at least certified, so the re -- an  
20 erosion and sediment control plans are required as part  
21 of the pre-qualification to become at least certified.

22 What we'll find, we'll start implementing  
23 as part of our new standards that we're currently working  
24 on, is that any sort of development that occurs, we'll  
25 have to incorporate a sediment and erosion control plan

1 to meet the satisfaction of the City. If any questions  
2 arise as to the quality of the plan, then we will  
3 approach Fisheries and Oceans for their input and -- and,  
4 I guess, support.

5 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy.

6 In 2009 the City of Yellowknife, this was  
7 indicated, has par -- created a stormwater effluent  
8 monitoring program.

9 The question is: Has the baseline data  
10 for this year been analyzed and compared to appropriate  
11 guidelines?

12 MS. WENDY ALEXANDER: Wendy Alexander,  
13 with the City.

14 The results of our sampling program have  
15 been compared to the recreational water use and the --  
16 it's quality for aquatic life, or protection of aquatic  
17 life guidelines, as well. And we found that the only  
18 items that were above these regulations were certain  
19 metal types, which are also associated with rock that has  
20 high arsenic content.

21 So in order to determine whether or not  
22 they actually are of a concern, we still need to  
23 determine background levels of -- of metal concentrations  
24 in -- throughout the City.

25 MR. LUKE NOVY: I'm just going to pose

1 the question to the floor, as well, if -- do you see a  
2 need for water -- stormwater quality effluent discharge  
3 limits? And if so, if there's any specific parameters  
4 that you would have of interest?

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Adrian Paradis, on  
9 behalf of the Land and Water Board.

10 At this time, it's not -- we don't  
11 probably expect you to actually be able to answer it, but  
12 maybe during your November 27th response to the Board you  
13 can include it, or provide a rationale to why you should  
14 include it or should not, and anything you'd like to  
15 maybe see?

16 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks, Adrian. Anyone  
17 else have any questions on stormwater?

18 Okay, that looks like a no. We're moving  
19 along pretty quick here so we're certainly probably going  
20 to be wrapping this up prior to lunch here. But the next  
21 little topic I had was management plans.

22 So once again, just jump in.

23

24 QUESTION PERIOD RE MANAGEMENT PLANS:

25 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: It's Robert Jenkins,

1 with INAC.

2 Just wondering if the City has had a  
3 chance to look at our guidelines for spill contingency  
4 planning and whether or not the -- you guys would  
5 consider having your plan conform with those guidelines?

6 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Dennis, if I can  
7 jump in. It's Adrian Paradis.

8 The Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board,  
9 on behalf of -- well, not on behalf of all the Boards,  
10 but the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board, as all  
11 panels, Wek'eezhii, Gwich'in, Sahtu, and Section 103 here  
12 in Yellowknife, have adopted -- officially adopted INAC's  
13 spill contingency guidelines as their guidelines, as of  
14 September 5th, or something like that, of 2009. So the  
15 Board, when it does review and approve spill contingency  
16 plans, uses INAC's guidelines as their base document.

17 So with that question, can you please  
18 respond to Robert?

19 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Actually, we haven't  
20 had a chance to review it, Robert, but -- Dennis Kefalas,  
21 with the City -- but we'll hopefully have an answer by  
22 the 10th of February of 2010. We don't anticipate any --  
23 I mean, we have to look at it and see how much it  
24 entails, but I don't think there should be a problem.

25 Just a question to the Board: Has GNWT

1 actually -- have they adopted these plans too?

2 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: To the best of my  
3 knowledge, I believe they're part of the spill  
4 contingency response plan or -- not that I know of. I'm  
5 just trying to think. They're part of the working group  
6 -- spills working group.

7 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Yeah, it's Robert  
8 Jenkins, with INAC.

9 I mean, the guidelines were developed by  
10 INAC so they are what -- what our department considers --  
11 recommends should be included within a -- you know, what  
12 we would consider an appropriate spill contingency plan.

13 Obviously, there's, you know, room for a  
14 little bit of leeway. I mean, some things might not fit  
15 with every site. I mean, you have a site specific plan,  
16 right. So -- so -- but in most instances we feel that,  
17 you know, what we've laid out in those guidelines would  
18 be, you know, a solid base for what -- what's needed.

19 The Boards have adopted those. The  
20 guidelines did initially go out for a round of engagement  
21 from different parties, so we've received input from  
22 them, you know, different parties before we finalized  
23 them and released them.

24 But the Board has graciously adopted them,  
25 so I'm assuming it will be a requirement within your

1 licence. So it's more of a heads up to -- to look at  
2 them, and -- and if there is any deviations from your  
3 current plan, to incorporate those.

4 MR. CHRIS GREENCORN: Chris Greencorn,  
5 the City of Yellowknife.

6 We've taken the stance with -- with both  
7 our stormwater management plan and our spill contingency  
8 plan, as we kind of consider them working documents.

9 So if we've got to -- we've got to --  
10 we're starting to ramp it up and -- and update these more  
11 often, whether it's phone numbers or what have you, so  
12 we'll be looking at those things on a more continuous  
13 basis. So I can't see a problem coming online with what  
14 INAC recommends.

15 Similarly, with the stormwater management  
16 plan, as -- as we get fed more and more data and baseline  
17 data and things like that, we'll continually update those  
18 -- update those plans. Thanks.

19 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. I was just --  
20 the question is in relation to the landfill closure plan.

21 If the City of Yellowknife could provide  
22 some details on what this plan will consist and,  
23 specifically, if erosion and surface water drainage  
24 management would be considered, and, also, the post and  
25 after closure operation and maintenance monitoring

1 activities that will be included in this plan.

2 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Once we actually  
3 submit the plan, we'll incorporate all those aspects and  
4 hopefully meet the satisfaction of the Board.

5 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Adrian Paradis, on  
6 behalf of the Land and Water Board. You'll just have to  
7 refresh my memory.

8 When is the anticipated date that you're  
9 planning on trying to submit? I believe you talked about  
10 it briefly before. I'm just trying to remember.

11 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
12 the City. With the closure plan or --

13 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Yes.

14 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: With the closure  
15 plan, probably looking at the third quarter of -- third  
16 or -- probably fourth quarter of 2010.

17 We just want to actually install the clean  
18 liner and monitor equipment and have some data to  
19 actually pass along to the Board for their review.

20 MR. LUKE NOVY: Luke Novy. A guideline -  
21 - oh, sorry. A guideline for the preparation and of  
22 operations and manuals for sewage and solid waste  
23 disposal facilities is provided by the Northwest  
24 Territories.

25 This guideline provides a list of items to

1 this community and staff for the proper -- proper  
2 operation and maintenance of the landfill facility. Some  
3 of the guideline items could be found in water licence  
4 application reports. However, as a standalone document,  
5 the -- the items were not contained or -- in all of -- in  
6 the -- in the manual.

7                   Could the City of Yellowknife indicate if  
8 they plan on incorporating the items as suggested by the  
9 guideline in any future operations and maintenance  
10 manuals?

11                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
12 the City. Could you be more specific of which  
13 guidelines?

14                   MR. LUKE NOVY: It's called the Guideline  
15 for the Preparation and -- Preparation of Operation and  
16 Maintenance Manuals for Sewage and Solid Waste Disposal  
17 Facilities. It's provided -- it was developed by the  
18 Government of the Northwest Territories Municipal  
19 Affairs, 1996.

20                   We could provide you specific reference  
21 for it.

22                   MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
23 the City.

24                   We have a copy of those documents and we -  
25 - we -- what you'll find is there -- I guess they were

1 generated for more -- for communities much smaller than  
2 the City of Yellowknife, and, essentially, for -- and  
3 especially for the method of how they dispose of their --  
4 their landfill -- or their waste.

5                   We can have it -- we can review them and  
6 see if anything actually applies to the City of  
7 Yellowknife. And what we find is they're too generic and  
8 don't really meet our needs, and so we've developed our  
9 own solid waste management plan.

10                   And we plan on doing the same with the  
11 lagoon, but, like we said, we want to conduct our -- or  
12 actually complete our management operating system and  
13 then develop the operation manual for the lagoon once  
14 that's -- once that -- once -- once we've completed the  
15 first phase of our management operation system.

16

17                   (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19                   THE FACILITATOR: Does anybody else have  
20 anything? Any questions...?

21                   MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald. I  
22 just have a comment about the duration requested for the  
23 licence.

24                   Environment Canada would prefer to see  
25 something more along the lines of ten (10) years as

1 opposed to fifteen (15) as a means of -- there's been  
2 some noncompliance over the duration of this licence in  
3 terms of getting plans in on time. So we would just like  
4 to ensure that things are getting done on time before the  
5 longer term is granted. So we're looking for ten (10)  
6 years at this point.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Anyone else...? All  
8 right. Well, then I guess -- oh, do you have something,  
9 Rob?

10 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Yeah, just one (1)  
11 thing. It's Robert Jenkins.

12 I was wondering about the -- one (1) of  
13 the things that, with the upcoming strategy from this  
14 waste water, CBOD is one (1) of the -- the new  
15 requirements. Currently you guys are sampling for BOD.  
16 And -- and I know there's a bit of a, sort of a -- I  
17 guess the City would like there to be a decision on  
18 whether or not it's one or the other to be -- to be  
19 sampled for.

20 And I'm just wondering, other than sort of  
21 simply cost, you know, INAC feels there is a bit of a  
22 benefit to continue sampling BOD at least for a period,  
23 you know, while you're -- you, you know, conduct new  
24 sampling for CBOD, simply because you've got an extended  
25 day to set now for BOD. And I guess if you start, you

1 know, taking CBOD samples and you see something strange,  
2 you've got nothing to sort of go against, you know, your  
3 -- your longer record.

4 So, I'm -- I'm just wondering if -- if the  
5 City is -- has sort of thought a little more about --  
6 about whether they would be open to doing both for at  
7 least a limited period of time under the new licence?

8 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, for  
9 the City. Yeah, we're hoping that we could have an  
10 amendment and change the CBOD but we have -- we would --  
11 we have -- I don't know what I'm trying to say...

12 Yeah, we have no problem with actually  
13 testing for both, for a -- a duration but if -- if that  
14 duration could be specified within the licence  
15 requirements that would help -- just help us in terms of,  
16 you know, allocating appropriate funding and saying,  
17 here's where we're doing, so if there's an actual plan in  
18 place for both us and for all the stakeholders.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 THE FACILITATOR: Do you have anything  
23 else?

24 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: It's Robert Jenkins  
25 again. I guess the -- the -- the only thing that we'd

1 like to sort of say to end off is that if -- if the City  
2 is strongly considering a change to its -- its compliance  
3 point and we'd like to sort of know that so we could sort  
4 of engage in some talks with you guys.

5 MR. ADRIAN PARADIS: Adrian Paradis, on  
6 behalf of the Land and Water Board.

7 The Board will need to know too because it  
8 does have an impact on how the Board will issue the  
9 licence and any potential amendments going forward to  
10 actually have to change that. There will have to be some  
11 internal discussions about how to try and figure out how,  
12 if -- how to incorporate that best -- best to incorporate  
13 that.

14 So the sooner the -- sooner the City of  
15 Yellowknife can inform the Board, the Board can then  
16 inform the City about how it will deal with the request.

17 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
18 the City.

19 We should have an answer to you by the  
20 23rd, which should allow for the -- to meet the deadline  
21 for interventions to be registered with the Board.

22 MS. JANE FITZGERALD: Jane Fitzgerald.

23 Just to clarify, so will this be  
24 information provided to the Board and distributed to all  
25 parties?

1 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, it will.

2 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: Yeah, it's Robert  
3 Jenkins with INAC again.

4 I guess, if you're going to do that, if  
5 it's -- we'd like to have some rationale, obviously, with  
6 your -- you know, not simply a letter saying, We'd like  
7 to move our compliance point.

8 And the 23rd, four (4) days, that doesn't  
9 give a ton of time to -- to make a -- a very thorough  
10 analysis of -- of that, but, you know, we -- we'd try to  
11 meet the time line set by the Board as best we can, and  
12 the information -- I mean, right now we're -- we're sort  
13 of -- you know, we're considering that you guys might do  
14 that, but we'd like to -- to know more why.

15 So we're not in favour of a move right  
16 now, but we're open to -- open to hearing any rationale  
17 that you guys might provide.

18 MR. CHRIS GREENCORN: Chris Greencorn.

19 They're your guidelines, right? The 100  
20 metres offshore are set by INAC, correct?

21 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: It's Robert Jenkins.

22 No, those are CCME guidelines from the  
23 Minister of the Environment, so -- so they're -- I guess  
24 the -- the question becomes 100 metres is what's set  
25 there, but it's 100 metres from the receiving

1 environment. So there's a -- there needs to be a bit of  
2 a rationale of -- and definition of what that receiving  
3 environment is.

4 So -- so again, I mean, we're interested  
5 in hearing from you guys on -- on your rationale for a  
6 move of the ultimate receiving environment being Great  
7 Slave Lake versus the receiving environment being  
8 downstream of your current compliance point.

9 So -- so that's -- I agree that 100 metres  
10 is what's set there, but it's -- it's what's in reference  
11 to receiving environment.

12 MR. CHRIS GREENCORN: Chris Greencorn,  
13 with the City.

14 I also want to go back to your BOD there,  
15 Rob. Which one (1) of those -- we don't mind on -- we  
16 don't mind testing for both, but which one (1) of those  
17 are you going to use to govern BOD, or CBOD? Because  
18 your guidelines say CBOD at 40 milligrams, but right now  
19 our limits are 20 milligrams BOD.

20 Are you going to expect to see us stay at  
21 20 milligrams BOD, or...

22 MR. ROBERT JENKINS: It's Robert Jenkins,  
23 again.

24 Again, it's that these are the new  
25 requirements of the strategy, right, so it's not -- just

1 to clarify, it's not INAC's requirements. But it's sort  
2 of the way that things are going right now, because those  
3 are the inevitable requirements that the city will face.

4           There is, what I understand, a period of  
5 time where -- where data can be collected that -- that  
6 could influence whether or not those Canada-wide numbers  
7 get applied up north or not. So -- so I guess in that  
8 period of time, you know, one (1) of the things which  
9 would be useful is to continue with your collection of  
10 BOD, as well as to -- to -- to sort of start looking at  
11 the new upcoming requirements of CBOD.

12           But -- but to be able to have something to  
13 cross-reference between the two (2), you know, if you get  
14 a COB -- a CBOD sample taken and you find that you're  
15 getting a hundred and fifty (150), and, well, what's  
16 going on, you know, this is -- this is crazy, but you  
17 continue to take your BOD with your long-term data set,  
18 and you say, Well, actually, there's no change in BOD, so  
19 what's -- we need to look at this further.

20           So that's sort of the benefit that we see  
21 with continuing your long-term record. At least for --  
22 we recognize a -- a specified time, but it appears -- and  
23 unless something changes, it appears to us that the COB -  
24 - CBOD will be the new requirement in the future.

25           MR. ADRIAN PARADIS:   Adrian Paradis, on

1 behalf of the Board.

2                   On that same thought, I mean, if any of  
3 the other Intervenors or the City of Yellowknife have an  
4 idea of that duration, so the Board can write it into the  
5 licence, if you can include that or make recommendations  
6 to the Board, it would be helpful, other than the Board  
7 basically then sitting down and making a decision in the  
8 boardroom saying, Well, three (3) years is sufficient,  
9 and not having something to help support that.

10                   MR. CHRIS GREENCORN: It's Chris  
11 Greencorn, with the City, and we've got no problems  
12 testing it, or continuing -- continuing to test it for  
13 whenever.

14                   I don't think Dennis can speak to that,  
15 but I guess what I'm getting at is if that's fine, we're  
16 going to test it, but to which -- to which are you -- to  
17 which are we going to be held to govern, CBOD, or BOD?  
18 Like which -- which parameter is going to be -- is going  
19 to be compliance, I guess? Thanks.

20                   Mr. ADRIAN PARADIS: Adrian Paradis, on  
21 behalf of the Board.

22                   Honestly, the decision hasn't been made on  
23 -- made by the Board yet. So what will happen is you've  
24 made out a request to have it changed. The Board will  
25 have to take into consideration the information put

1 forward. And if there's a change in -- going forward,  
2 there'll have to be a transition period that's accounted  
3 for.

4 I don't -- I cannot -- I can't speak on  
5 behalf of the Board but basically the idea would be -- I  
6 can't see the Board just simply saying, That's the new  
7 Dettah licence, you're now -- you have to be in  
8 compliance with CBOD, when there's not been a transition  
9 into that.

10 So how and when that occurs or how that  
11 occurs, your thoughts will help determine that. And it  
12 will be -- if you present that forward to the Board --  
13 the Board can -- can look at it and consider it.

14 MR. DENNIS KEFALAS: Dennis Kefalas, with  
15 the City.

16 We don't anticipate asking for a change in  
17 our compliance location during this water licence, but  
18 it'll probably be coming in the next one. It depends.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Is that it,  
20 guys?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 THE FACILITATOR: All right. Well, I  
25 guess if there's nothing else, we can wrap it up for

1 today. We're done way ahead of schedule.

2 Yes, and I just -- I'll just thank  
3 everyone for coming again. And I will be circulating a  
4 list of action items from this meeting, along with a  
5 newer version of the draft work plan for this. And,  
6 yeah, just a reminder that your interventions are due on  
7 the 27th of November.

8 And feel free to grab some more snacks on  
9 your way out.

10

11 --- Upon adjourning at 11:25 a.m.

12

13

14

15

16 Certified correct,

17

18

19

20

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
Wendy Warnock, Ms.

22

23

24

25