NRCan's Response (Aug. 1, 2012) to the Proponent's Response of March 30, 2012

Tuktoyaktuk Highway Project

IR141:

Borrow Resources

It is NRCan's understanding that the proponent has not fully addressed this question. The characterization by the proponents of what locally are clay-rich tills (cf., Rampton, 1988) as Class 4 material (defined as "silty, poorly-graded, fine-grained sand with minor gravel") is incorrect. It is NRCan's impression that the granular aggregate studies have examined materials within the context of coarse granular materials only, and specifically those that might be used for road surface and building pad construction. It is unclear if the specific context of construction of thick road embankments was considered in this EIS (please note, NRCan did not have time to review through all the historical studies of the various granular aggregate sites along the Highway alignments listed by the proponent). Certainly in wet, boggy terrain of northern AB, BC and southern NWT, road embankment construction with clay-rich till is considered advantageous, as long as it can be suitably top-dressed with a gravel material. It is NRCan's understanding that this question could be further explored at the Technical Review stage.

NRCan notes that in the "Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk Highway – Baseline Data Acquisition Program: Terrain Evaluation (Terrain Report)" they have actually made advantageous use of the drillers' log records within the bounds of the targeted granular aggregate sites. This would constitute a degree of "field verification" that the proponents suggest is lacking for this "largely new" dataset, and argues further for their utility in identifying and characterizing surficial geology materials throughout the development area.