


From: Lefebvre, Larry (MOECC) Larry.Lefebvre@ontario.ca 
Subject: RE: A question regarding DeBeers 2013 Mercury Performance Report...
Date: December 15, 2014 at 10:59 AM
To: trevor hesselink trevor.hesselink@me.com
Cc: Leith, Carroll (MOECC) Carroll.Leith@ontario.ca, Kondrat, Todd (MOECC) Todd.Kondrat@ontario.ca



Hi Mr. Hesselink,

With respect to your question on the De Beers 2013 Mercury Performance Report, I have obtained an explanation from Mr. Terry Ternes, Environmental Supervisor at the De Beers Victor Mine. Please find below the explanation provided to me by Mr. Ternes. I hope that the explanation has answered your question. Should you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly

Larry Lefebvre



Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Action en matière de changement climatique
Larry Lefebvre
Senior Environmental Officer\Agent Principal de L'Environnement
Timmins District Office\Bureau du district de Timmins
Ontario Government Complex\ Complexe du gouvernement de l'Ontario
5520 Highway 101 E, P.O. Bag 3080\5520 Route 101 Est, CP/Service de sacs 3080
South Porcupine, Ontario, P0N 1H0
(705) 235-1511 | 7 (705) 235-1520 email: larry.lefebvre@ontario.ca

Larry:

As we discussed this morning I have figured out why the sampling in the Mercury Annual Report for **Well Discharge** is incorrect. When you review the data in the Mercury report it appears that Methyl Mercury is only being reported quarterly rather than monthly as indicated in the permit. When I reviewed our Annual Report at this location for **Final Discharge** Mercury and Methyl Mercury are being reported on a monthly basis.

I believe that we have an issue with nomenclature. At Victor, the sampling location near the Phase 1 ditch at the 36 inch line we call **Well Discharge**. This is not a permit location rather we sample here for process control. Where the water goes into the Water Intake, prior to the Attawapiskat River, we call this sampling location **Final Discharge**. When we first discharged to the Attawapiskat River the water intake was not built and our permitted sampling location we called **Well Discharge**. When the Water Intake was built and water was discharging through it we called the permitted sample location **Final Discharge**. So for Victor, Well Discharge and Final Discharge have two separate meanings. Final Discharge is actually our compliance point.

The Permit discusses Well Field Discharge and I suspect that this is where the confusion comes from. I believe that AMEC reported our Well Discharge numbers and not our Final Discharge results at least for Mercury and Methyl Mercury when then they prepared the reports. I have confirmed this in comparison with the tables. When the mercury data was sent to AMEC all of the mercury spreadsheet data was sent

at the same time and the results for Well Discharge, Final Discharge and others were together. Hence AMEC picked out the Well discharge numbers as this is what the permit names the location.

The data reported for the well discharge is for the combination of all the wells but our compliance point is at the Final Discharge which is further downstream. The well discharge sampling location is used for process control. I asked AMEC to redo table 14 in FUPA and table 15 in the Mercury Report so that the correct numbers can be reported.

I apologize for this and we will correct the data as soon as possible and distribute the revised tables and graphs.

Terry J. Ternes P. Geo.
Environmental Supervisor
De Beers Canada Inc.
Victor Mine
Phone: (416) 645-3888 Ext. 5779
Fax: (416) 645-3902
e-mail: terry.ternes@debeersgroup.com

From: trevor hesselink [mailto:trevor.hesselink@me.com]
Sent: December 02, 2014 4:00 PM
To: Lefebvre, Larry (MOECC)
Cc: Leith, Carroll (MOECC)
Subject: Re: A question regarding DeBeers 2013 Mercury Performance Report...

Thanks Larry/Carroll, I appreciate your help on this.

~T

Trevor Hesselink, MCIP, RPP
Director, Policy and Research
Wildlands League
416-707-9841 (mobile)
416-971-9453 ext. 33
www.wildlandsleague.org

On Dec 2, 2014, at 3:47 PM, Lefebvre, Larry (MOECC)
<Larry.Lefebvre@ontario.ca> wrote:

Hi Trevor,

I am in receipt of you e-mail, and will forward your question to our Surface Water Specialist who actually conducts the reviews of the reports. Once I get some information, I will pass it on to you.

Thanks

Larry

<image001.png>

Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change

Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Action en matière de changement climatique

Larry Lefebvre

Senior Environmental Officer\Agent Principal de L'Environnement

Timmins District Office\Bureau du district de Timmins

Ontario Government Complex\ Complexe du gouvernement de l'Ontario

5520 Highway 101 E, P.O. Bag 3080\5520 Route 101 Est, CP/Service de sacs 3080

South Porcupine, Ontario, P0N 1H0

(705) 235-1511 | 7 (705) 235-1520 email: larry.lefebvre@ontario.ca

From: trevor hesselink [<mailto:trevor.hesselink@me.com>]

Sent: December 02, 2014 3:41 PM

To: Lefebvre, Larry (MOECC)

Subject: A question regarding DeBeers 2013 Mercury Performance Report...

Hello Larry,

I am in receipt of a copy of the subject report courtesy of DeBeers, and just working my way through it slowly. My question at the moment is this:

Do you have any information / perspective to supply with respect to the frequency of reporting gaps for the monthly MeHg reporting of combined wellfield effluent, per condition 6(3) of the Industrial Sewage Works approval?

It seems to me that they are only reporting values approximately 50% of the time, with no apparent pattern to the gaps.

Would appreciate your thoughts on this.

Regards

~T

Trevor Hesselink, MCIP, RPP

Director, Policy and Research

Wildlands League

416-707-9841 (mobile)

416-971-9453 ext. 33

www.wildlandsleague.org