



MC LENNAN ROSS LLP  
LEGAL COUNSEL

Our File Reference: 111388

**Douglas I. Evanchuk**  
Direct Line: (780) 482-9106  
e-mail: devanchuk@mross.com

**Debbie Donald, Assistant**  
Direct Line: (780) 482-9283

Fax: (780) 482-9102

*PLEASE REPLY TO EDMONTON OFFICE*

June 23, 2017

MacKenzie Valley Land and Water Board  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor, 4922 – 48<sup>th</sup> Street  
Yellowknife, NWT

Attention: Shannon Allerston, Regulatory Officer

Dear Madame:

**Re: Northwest Territories Power Corporation (“NTPC”) Application for Type “A” Water  
Licence Pursuant to the *Waters Act*, S.N.W.T. 2014, c.18  
Board File No. MV 2011 L4-0002  
Final Submissions of NTPC**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

Please accept these final submissions of NTPC as directed by the Board at the compensation re-hearing held in Yellowknife on May 16 and 17, 2017 (the “**Re-Hearing**”), and in subsequent correspondence from the Board. These submissions specifically address the Undertakings given at the Re-Hearing and the Carter Family’s responses provided with respect to those Undertakings.

Undertaking No. 1 given at the Re-Hearing is as follows:

The Northwest Territories Power Corporation will have the opportunity to review the “Report on Samples of Lake Trout, Lake Whitefish, and Northern Pike Taken from Nonacho Lake, NWT, Summer 2014, and Analyzed for Mercury” by R. A. Bodaly and submit written questions on the report to Board staff and the other party by May 26, 2017. The Carter Family will have until June 9, 2017, to respond to Northwest Territories Power Corporation’s questions through responses from its expert.

**Edmonton Office**

600 McLennan Ross Building  
12220 Stony Plain Road  
Edmonton, AB T5N 3Y4  
p. 780.482.9200  
f. 780.482.9100  
tf. 1.800.567.9200

**Calgary Office**

1000 First Canadian Centre  
350 – 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Calgary, AB T2P 3N9  
p. 403.543.9120  
f. 403.543.9150  
tf. 1.888.543.9120

**Yellowknife Office**

301 Nunasi Building  
5109 – 48<sup>th</sup> Street  
Yellowknife, NT X1A 1N5  
p. 867.766.7677  
f. 867.766.7678  
tf. 1.888.836.6684

On May 26, 2017, NTPC submitted questions on the Undertaking No. 1 in response to the late filing of evidence by the Carter Family, namely the *Report on Samples of Lake Trout, Lake Whitefish, and Northern Pike Taken from Nonacho Lake, NWT, Summer 2014, and Analyzed for Mercury by R.A. Bodaly* (the “**Bodaly May 2017 Report**”). No questions on the 2014 Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program Report or the *Competitive Analysis of the Outfitted Recreational Sport Fishing Sector of the Northwest Territories March, 2014* (the “**2014 Sport Fishing Analysis Report**”) were submitted by the Carter Family. The Carter Family responded to the questions on Undertaking No. 1 on June 9, 2017, and provided their final submissions on June 16, 2017 (the “**Carter Family Final Submissions**”).

## 2. SUBMISSIONS OF NTPC

Nothing in the Carter Family Final Submissions, or any other submissions made by the Carter Family for that matter, resolve the fundamental problem with their case: *they have failed to demonstrate that NTPC's operations under the current licence will cause any adverse environmental effects or economic loss.*

### a. Status of Adverse Effects and Compensation Findings

Starting at page 2 of the Carter Family Final Submissions, they argue that the Board's initial decision of November 24, 2011 (“**Initial Decision**”) found that the Carters would suffer adverse effects, which was not altered by Justice Shaner's ruling,<sup>1</sup> and therefore the sole issue for the Board to decide at this time is the amount of compensation that should be awarded. With respect, this is a misapprehension of the issues currently before the Board.

Further to the submissions in my correspondence to the Board of May 8, 2017, we submit that the question of whether the Carter Family has been, or will be, adversely affected by NTPC's use of waters under the current licence has not yet been conclusively decided by the Board. This is because in its Initial Decision and licence approval, the Board did not provide any specific findings on adverse effects, but instead left that matter to be decided by NTPC and the Carter Family.

The following was the principal condition on compensation placed upon NTPC in the initial licence approval:<sup>2</sup>

J.1 The Licensee is directed to determine the nature and extent of the adverse effects its operations shall have on the Deninu K'ue First Nation and the Carter Family.

The only finding of the Board concerning effects of the operations of NTPC on the Carter Family, in the Board's reasons for the Initial Decision, was stated as follows:<sup>3</sup>

The Carter Family's intervention contained a specific notice of their claim for compensation. Although they acknowledged that the Board's jurisdiction does not allow the Board to determine compensation for past adverse affects, they argued that they do qualify as users of the water who stand to be adversely affected in the future by the continuation of operation of the Taltson

---

<sup>1</sup> *Carter v. Northwest Territories Power Corp.*, 2014 NWTSC 19.

<sup>2</sup> See Part J – Conditions Applying to Compensation – Licence in letter to Minister dated December 1, 2011. and Reasons for Decision.

<sup>3</sup> See Reasons for Decision of the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board re File MV2011L4-0002, as per Meeting Dated November 24, 2011, Page 11 of 13 re Part J – Conditions Applying to Compensation.

facilities. The Board is satisfied that the Carter Family would be adversely affected by the Licensee's operation under this Licence.

The Board's findings set out in the above captions lack any specificity and clarity as to what adverse effects claimed by the Carter Family require compensation to be paid by NTPC. To the contrary, the Board (at the time) clearly directed NTPC to "determine the nature and effect" of its operations on the Carter Family. That direction was never fulfilled because the Minister found the direction to be invalid.

It is therefore clear from the foregoing that at no time have the nature and effects of NTPC's operations on the Nonacho Lake fishing lodge been conclusively determined by the Board. Those matters remain to be considered by the Board as part of these Re-Hearing proceedings. With respect, Counsel for the Carter Family has therefore misapprehended and misstated the legal effect of the Board's previous findings as to adverse effects.

Regarding the claim by Counsel for the Carter Family that the Board has already ordered compensation to be paid to the Carter Family, such a claim is also incorrect and misapprehends previous rulings. Justice Shaner's ruling quashed those portions of the Board's previous decision and the Minister's previous approval dealing with compensation for the Carters.

As a result, there is no binding decision of the Board on NTPC with respect to paying compensation to the Carter Family pursuant to the *Waters Act*. Those matters are also remain to be considered by the Board as part of these Re-Hearing proceedings.

Further, the Carter Family Final Submissions repeat and continue to argue that impacts from operations under past licences should be compensable. As discussed at the Re-Hearing and in previous submissions, this approach is clearly misguided. As confirmed by Justice Shaner, the legislation provides that compensation under this regulatory scheme is forward-looking and only applies to NTPC's use of waters under *this* licence. Impacts from operations under past licences, if any, are not compensable under the regulatory scheme, including these proceedings. Simply put, the Board does not have jurisdiction to award compensation for impacts resulting from operations under past licences.

The parties' respective technical experts, Dr. Bodaly and Mr. Cote, agreed at the Re-Hearing that there would be no change to environmental conditions such as mercury concentrations at Nonacho Lake resulting from NTPC's operations under the current licence. Further, when questioned by Board Counsel at the Re-Hearing, Dean Carter acknowledged that no changes in the alleged adverse effects would result if the current licence had not been granted by the Board in 2011.<sup>4</sup> In other words, through their own testimony the Carter Family acknowledged that there will be no change to the environmental conditions at Nonacho Lake by NTPC's operations under the current licence.

In order to make out a claim for compensation, the Carter Family must prove the following:

1. Environmental impacts will be caused by NTPC's operations under this licence. If this step is not satisfied, the Board's analysis can stop and no compensation is payable.
2. If environmental impacts are proven, the Carter Family must prove that those impacts have led to economic losses. If this step is not satisfied, the Board's analysis can stop and no compensation for any economic losses claimed may be awarded.

---

<sup>4</sup> Taltson Compensation Re-Hearing Transcripts May 17, 2017 (Day 2) at pages 119:7-120:7.

3. If steps 1 and 2 are satisfied, the Board then has to determine if the compensation should be reduced, and by how much, due to mitigation measures flowing from the licence conditions imposed by the Board.

NTPC submits that the Carter Family has not satisfied either steps 1 or 2, and no compensation should be awarded on this basis alone.

**b. Carter Family's Failure to Consider Industry Trends and Unreasonable Amounts Sought**

Despite the fact that the Carter Family has failed to show a causal connection between NTPC's operations under the current licence and the compensation claimed, NTPC provides the following submissions with respect to the Carter Family Final Submissions on economic losses.

The Carter Family Final Submissions argue that the legislation does not support the quantification of compensation used by NTPC. This is simply not the case. The legislation expressly states that compensation is to be paid in an amount that "the Board considers appropriate"<sup>5</sup> and that the "Board shall consider all relevant factors"<sup>6</sup> when determining the amount to be paid, if any. The legislation clearly gives the Board discretion in deciding what compensation is to be paid and on what basis to arrive at that amount. The *Waters Act* does not endorse the approach advanced by the Carter Family nor preclude the approach used by NTPC, as suggested in the Carter Family Final Submissions. NTPC respectfully submits that the economic losses claimed by the Carter Family are unreasonable and upon consideration of all relevant factors, including well-established external industry trends and market comparables, the compensation sought by the Carter Family cannot be justified.

NTPC discussed the 2014 Sport Fishing Analysis Report in its April 18, 2017 submissions, and does not intend to repeat those submissions here. However, we take this opportunity to respond to the recent submissions of the Carter Family.

The Carter Family appears to be taking the position that their business at Nonacho Lake is somehow immune from well-established external factors that have affected the sport fishing industry as a whole in the Northwest Territories. There is no basis for this assertion.

The Odyssey Chartered Account & Advisor Report, April 23, 2012 (the "**Odyssey Report**") at Appendix "A" provided independent and objective data from the GNWT that fishing tourism visitation and spending trends in the Northwest Territories from 2006 through 2011 fell steadily and sharply throughout this period. This casts significant doubt upon the claims of the Carter Family that lodge patronage would remain not only steady throughout the 2012-2027 period, but would have stayed at the average level seen during 1979-1996, but for NTPC's operations of the Taltson Facility. Those negative industry trends identified by Odyssey in 2012 continue for the sport fishing industry as confirmed in the 2014 Sport Fishing Analysis Report. Against the clear, objective and independent backdrop of declining industry trends, the Carter Family's lost patronage claims are, again, completely unsupported.

The Carter Family Final Submissions attempt to criticize the use of comparables in the valuation approach employed by NTPC. However, as discussed at the Re-Hearing, comparables were used to check the reasonableness of the conclusions reached by the Carter Family's economic expert, KRP. Clearly, it

---

<sup>5</sup> *Waters Act*, SNWT 2014, c 18, s. 26(5)(b) ["*Waters Act*"]. The provisions of the *Waters Act* relevant to this matter are substantively the same as the previous *NWT Waters Act* that was repealed upon devolution.

<sup>6</sup> *Waters Act*, s. 26(6).

is illogical to find losses that are many multiples (for example, 10 times in some cases) of what other Northwest Territories lodges had transacted for in the recent past, as the Carter Family is seeking. If other Northwest Territories lodges did generate the profits that KRP is saying have been lost by the Carter Family, the transaction prices would be materially higher than what the market actually shows. The comparables show that the economic losses claimed by the Carter Family are unreasonable.

The Carter Family has provided no response whatsoever to the undeniable declining industry trends, and no explanation at all for how the Nonacho Lake lodge is immune from those conditions, while other operators are not.

The Carter Family merely asserts in their final submissions that the assumptions of the 2014 Sport Fishing Analysis Report are inapplicable to the Nonacho Lake lodge. This assertion appears to be based on mercury issues and perceived reduction in fish populations. However, this position does not assist the Carter Family because issues regarding mercury and reductions in fish populations, if any, would not result from NTPC's operations under the current licence. Again, the parties' respective technical experts agreed at the Re-Hearing that there would be no change to environmental conditions such as mercury concentrations, and through their own testimony the Carter Family acknowledged that there will be no change to the alleged adverse effects by NTPC's operations under the current licence.

**c. Deficiencies of the Bodaly May 2017 Report and Carter Family Undertaking Responses**

The Bodaly May 2017 Report was submitted to the Board shortly after 12:00 am on the morning that the Re-Hearing began, May 16, 2016, despite the data presented therein being available since 2014. Upon review of the Bodaly May 2017 Report, significant deficiencies were identified. Pursuant to Undertaking No. 1, NTPC posed questions to the Carter Family to clarify issues with the Bodaly May 2017 Report. However, the answers provided do not address the fundamental problems with the Bodaly May 2017 Report: the data presented is selective, incomplete and the analysis provided contains additional errors. In fact, some of these problems are repeated in the Carter Family Undertaking responses.

The following submissions are in response to the specific questions posed by NTPC to the Carter Family pursuant to Undertaking No. 1:

i. NTPC Question 1

*Question 1*

1(a). Please confirm the location (i.e., name of the lake) where samples CLLKTR- 1 to CL-LKTR-7 were collected.

1(b). Do the "CL" references in the sample identification names refer to a Control Lake?

1(c). If the "CL" references in the sample identification names do refer to a Control Lake, what is the name of that lake?

1(d). If the "CL" references in the sample identification names do refer to a Control Lake, on what conditions was the Control Lake selected?

*Carter Family Response*

The lake coded as CL is McArthur Lake, NWT. McArthur Lake is located at 61° 34' N, 106° 48' W. The coding was completed by Applied Aquatic Research Ltd. The Carter Family has no information with respect to why "CL" was used to code the McArthur Lake samples.

ii. NTPC Comment on Question 1 Response

A typical practice for the design and implementation of a Mercury in Fish Flesh Monitoring Program is to establish a control. Controls are used to minimize the effects of variables and increase the reliability of results. Specifically, controls are critical to increase the reliability of long-term trend analysis.

The sample collection was completed by Applied Aquatic Research Ltd. NTPC understands that Applied Aquatic Research Ltd. specializes in this area of study and likely would have used a control system to increase the reliability in the data. The chain of custody form provided by Applied Aquatic Research Ltd. to ALS Environmental laboratories references McArthur Lake as sample site "CL". The typical practice in submitting samples for lab analysis is to list the control with an anonymous identifier, for example "CL", and not to include the name of the control site in order to prevent potential bias in the treatment of the control samples. In addition, if the samples collected at McArthur Lake were not intended to be a control for this sampling event, they likely would not have been included on the same chain of custody form as the Nonacho Lake samples, but they were. As such, and given the lack of information provided by the Carter Family response to this question, it is reasonable to conclude that McArthur Lake was selected by Applied Aquatic Research Ltd. as a control lake to compare to the data from Nonacho Lake.

iii. NTPC Question 2

*Question 2*

The ALS Environmental Analytical Report included in Appendix 2 of the Report is missing pages 6, 7, and 8. It appears as though the missing pages contain the analysis of all lake trout samples collected from Site "CL". Please provide the ALS Environmental Analytical Report in its entirety.

*Carter Family Response*

Pages 6, 7, and 8 of the ALS Environmental Analytical Report are enclosed.

iv. NTPC Comment on Question 2 Response

The information provided completes the ALS Environmental Analytical Report; however, it also gives rise to an additional gap in Appendix 2: the chain of custody form is incomplete. Pages 4 and 5 of the chain of custody are missing. This further incomplete documentation leaves NTPC and the Board again in a position where it cannot be verified what other sampling or analysis may have been conducted in conjunction with the 2014 sampling event.

v. NTPC Question 3

*Question 3*

The median value of mercury concentration in fish muscle from Nonacho Lake based on the 2014 lab results presented in Appendix 1 of the Report is 0.4165 ug/g. In comparison, the median value of mercury concentrations in fish muscle

from Site "CL" based on the 2014 lab results is 0.6125 ug/g (only samples CLLKTR-1 to CL-LKTR-5 were used in this calculation as the ALS Environmental Analytical Report is incomplete). Please provide an analysis of all data available for Site "CL" with comparisons to Nonacho Lake, the Commercial Sales of Fish Guidelines and Frequent Consumer of Fish Guidelines.

*Carter Family Response*

Analysis of data from McArthur Lake, including comparisons to Nonacho Lake, and comparisons to fish consumption guidelines is shown in the table below. All data are for 2014.

Lake	Species	Number of Samples	Mercury Mean	Mercury Median	% Over Commercial Guideline	% Over Frequent Guideline
McArthur	Lake Trout	20	0.62	0.59	75	100
	Lake Whitefish	4	0.10	0.10	0	0
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	8	0.61	0.44	25	88
	Lake Whitefish	14	0.11	0.10	0	7
	Northern Pike	7	0.41	0.25	14	86

vi. NTPC Comment on Question 3 Response

The analysis presented by the Carter Family shows that lake trout mean and median mercury concentrations are higher in McArthur Lake (the presumed control system) compared to Nonacho Lake. The data shows that 75% of the lake trout tested from McArthur Lake exceed commercial mercury guidelines, as compared to 25% from Nonacho Lake. All lake trout tested from McArthur Lake exceeded the frequent consumer guideline, while only some from Nonacho Lake did.

In addition, the median mercury value for lake trout in Nonacho Lake provided in the table above is inconsistent with the data presented by Dr. Bodaly to the Board at the Re-Hearing. In Dr. Bodaly's presentation at the Re-Hearing, the median mercury concentration in muscle was 0.4165 µg/g w.w. The corresponding value in the table above is 0.44 µg/g w.w. In completing calculations of the data contained in the in the ALS Environmental Analytical Report, we see that the data provided in table above in response to NTPC's Question 3 is incorrect. The figure presented at the Re-Hearing appears to be the correct one.

Further, the median value presented in the table above for lake trout from MacArthur Lake is 0.59 µg/g w.w. Calculations completed on the data within the ALS Environmental Analytical Report indicate the median value for lake trout in McArthur Lake is actually 0.6125 µg/g w.w.

The errors in the Carter Family Question 3 Response wrongly show lake trout from Nonacho Lake having higher mercury levels that the data provides, while also showing lake trout from MacArthur Lake having lower mercury levels that the data provides.

Attached as **Appendix "A"** to these submission is a spreadsheet showing NTPC's calculations using the data from the ALS Environmental Analytical Report.

### 3. SUMMARY

The question of whether the Carter Family has been, or will be, adversely affected by NTPC's use of waters under the current licence has not yet been conclusively decided by the Board. This is because in its Initial Decision and licence approval, the Board did not provide any specific findings on adverse effects, but instead left that matter to be decided by NTPC and the Carter Family. Therefore, the nature and extent of adverse effects, if any, are still live issues before the Board, and it is open to the Board to award no compensation on the basis that the Carter Family has still failed to demonstrate the necessary causal link between NTPC's use of waters under the current licence and the compensation claimed.

The *Waters Act* clearly gives the Board discretion in deciding what compensation is to be paid and on what basis to arrive at that amount. The *Waters Act* does not endorse the approach advanced by the Carter Family nor preclude the approach used by NTPC, as suggested in the Carter Family Final Submissions.

The Carter Family has provided no response whatsoever to the undeniable declining industry trends, and no explanation at all for how the Nonacho Lake lodge is somehow immune from those conditions, while other operators are not.

The Carter Family merely asserts in their final submissions that the assumptions of the 2014 Sport Fishing Analysis Report are inapplicable to the Nonacho Lake lodge. This assertion appears to be based on mercury issues and perceived reduction in fish populations, impacts that have not and will not be caused by NTPC's operations under the current licence.

The comparables used by NTPC to check the reasonableness of KRP's conclusions show that the economic losses claimed by the Carter Family far exceed what the market actually shows, and are thus unreasonable.

The data and analysis presented in the Bodaly May 2017 Report and responses to NTPC's follow-up questions is selective, incomplete and inaccurate. As discussed above, McArthur Lake actually has higher mercury concentrations for lake trout as compared to Nonacho Lake. There is no dam or other control structure on McArthur Lake.

Relevant information in the ALS Environmental Analytical Report was omitted from the Bodaly May 2017 Report, and was provided only after NTPC identified the omission and asked for it, but even then the Carter Family Undertaking Responses do not present the data accurately and do not provided complete information. For example, the Carter Family Question 3 Response wrongly show lake trout from Nonacho Lake having higher mercury levels that the data provides, while also showing lake trout from MacArthur Lake having lower mercury levels that the data provides.

NTPC submits that the selective, incomplete and inaccurate disclosure of relevant information by the Carter Family entitles the Board to draw adverse inferences against the Carter Family and their experts with respect to the Bodaly May 2017 Report and Carter Family Undertaking responses.

However, regardless of the Carter Family's failure to consider established external industry factors, unreasonable basis for the economic losses claimed, deficiencies of the Bodaly May 2017 Report and Carter Family Undertaking responses, the Carter Family Final Submissions do not assist the Carter Family in any event because the issues raised regarding mercury and reductions in fish populations would not result from NTPC's operations under the current licence. The Carter Family's submissions continue to confuse, or choose to ignore, that past effects are not compensable in these proceedings.

The Carter Family has still failed to establish any causal link between NTPC's operations under the current licence and the alleged losses or which compensation is claimed.

NTPC continues to respectfully submit that the Board should not award any compensation to the Carter Family.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Douglas I. Evanchuk', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

DOUGLAS I. EVANCHUK

DIE/dld

Encl.

# APPENDIX "A"

## Mercury Concentration in Fish Flesh: Nonacho Lake and McArthur Lake

Data compiled from ALS Environmental Certificate of Analysis from Appendix 2 of Dr. Bodaly's report titled "Report on Samples of Lake Trout, Lake Whitefish, and Northern Pike taken from Nonacho Lake, NWT, Summer 2014, and Analyzed for Mercury"

Lake	Species	Sample ID	Mercury
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-1	0.413
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-2	2.13
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-3	0.297
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-4	0.181
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-5	0.638
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-6	0.465
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-7	0.42
Nonacho Lake	Lake Trout	NL-LKTR-8	0.351
		<b>Average</b>	<b>0.611875</b>
		<b>Median</b>	<b>0.4165</b>
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-1	0.137
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-2	0.0328
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-3	0.126
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-4	0.235
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-5	0.0936
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-6	0.106
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-7	
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-8	0.115
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-9	0.094
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-10	0.0888
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-11	0.0881
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-12	0.041

Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-13	0.156
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-14	0.114
Nonacho Lake	Lake Whitefish	NL-LKWH-15	0.0849
		<b>Average</b>	<b>0.11</b>
		<b>Median</b>	<b>0.1</b>
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-1	0.658
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-2	0.383
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-3	0.567
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-4	0.747
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-5	0.522
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-6	0.617
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-7	0.431
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-8	0.694
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-9	0.582
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-10	0.385
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-11	0.567
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-12	0.601
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-13	0.434
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-14	0.740
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-15	0.849
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-16	0.543
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-17	0.367
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-18	0.938
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-19	0.906
McArthur Lake	Lake Trout	CL-LKTR-20	0.881
		<b>Average</b>	<b>0.6206</b>
		<b>Median</b>	<b>0.6125</b>
McArthur Lake	Lake Whitefish	CL-LKWH-1	0.0873
McArthur Lake	Lake Whitefish	CL-LKWH-2	0.0994
McArthur Lake	Lake Whitefish	CL-LKWH-3	0.103
McArthur Lake	Lake Whitefish	CL-LKWH-4	0.0927
		<b>Average</b>	<b>0.10</b>
		<b>Median</b>	<b>0.10</b>

**From:** [Shannon Allerston](#)  
**To:** [Shelagh Montgomery](#); [Rebecca Chouinard](#)  
**Cc:** [Permits](#)  
**Subject:** FW: MV2011L4-0002 - Taltson Compensation Claim Re-Hearing - Carter Family  
**Date:** Monday, June 26, 2017 8:46:46 AM  
**Attachments:** [2017\\_06\\_23\\_15\\_25\\_35.pdf](#)  
[Appendix A\\_Mercury Concentration in Fish Flesh Nonacho Lake and McArthur Lake.pdf](#)

---

FYI

NTPC Final comments on undertakings

---

**From:** Debbie Donald [mailto:[ddonald@mross.com](mailto:ddonald@mross.com)]  
**Sent:** June-23-17 3:43 PM  
**To:** Doug Evanchuk; Amanda Gauthier; Shannon Allerston  
**Cc:** Eleanor Olszewski; Sean Parker; Sheldon Toner; Caroline Wawzonek; Sharon W. Au; Matthew Miller  
**Subject:** RE: MV2011L4-0002 - Taltson Compensation Claim Re-Hearing - Carter Family

Good Afternoon,

Attached are the Submissions of NTPC in this matter.

*Debbie Donald*

Assistant to Douglas I. Evanchuk



**Debbie Donald** | Legal Assistant | direct 780.482.9283 | toll free 1.800.567.9200 | fax 780.482.9100  
**McLennan Ross LLP** | [www.mross.com](http://www.mross.com)  
600 McLennan Ross Building, 12220 Stony Plain Road, Edmonton, AB T5N 3Y4

This e-mail may contain confidential information and be subject to solicitor-client privilege. If received in error, please delete and advise sender. Thank you.

McLennan Ross LLP would like the opportunity to send you invitations and legal updates electronically. To give us permission please [click here](#).