

DEW Line Site Clean Up
Regulatory Meeting Notes

Meeting held in Iqaluit GOCB boardroom, December 1, 2004

In attendance: Bob Martin	INAC Contaminated Sites	867-979-7931
Jamal Shirley	NRI	867-979-7290
Stephanie Hawkins	INAC Waters	867-975-4555
Collette Spagnuslo	Environment Canada	867-975-4639
Jen Hayward	INAC Communications	867-979-7935
Lou Spagnuow	INAC CSP	867-979-7936
Derrick Moggy	DFO	867-979-8039
Natalie Plato	INAC	867-979-7934
Spencer Dewar	INAC	867-975-4283
Jim Wall	NRB (via teleconference)	
Chris Doupe	PWGSC	780-497-3868
Jared Buchko	PWGSC	780-497-3886
Shauna Daren	PWGSC	780-497-3841

Bob opened the meeting at 08:55

- indicated that Stephanie (NIRB) could not attend, so he would like to have a specific presentation for her
- referred to handouts to write comments on, then turn them in to us, or just bring up concerns during the meeting

EKALUGAD FJORD (FOX C) PRESENTATION

Natalie suggested that we remove the Inuit name from the title slide, as we don't want the community to think that the whole area is contaminated, and referring to the site as Ekalugad helps us stay consistent.

Much of the content of this presentation is similar to CAM F, so we will only focus on the differences.

Comments arising from Chris's slides

Comment	Response
Collette asked which way the contamination is migrating	Chris indicated that it is not migrating to any receptor, but the issue will still have to be dealt with

Natalie said that a QC study is not being referred to	As Chris and Jared had no knowledge of this study, Natalie will provide it to them
The term “little” contamination should be changed to make the point more clear	It will be changed to indicate that although there are exceedances, the levels are similar to background
Derek wondered how wide the river is	The channel is approximately 30 m, with approximately 6 m being wet width, and it is less than one meter deep
Natalie indicated that we may need DFO authorizations because char habitat may be disturbed	We will keep in touch with DFO
Stephanie asked if there was any chance for sediment contamination since none of the barrels contain any product	The river bed is gravel, so any product that may have been release has dissipated long ago
Jim asked if we are suggesting that no testing occurred around the barrels in the water	We have delineated contamination on land, but not in sediments or water
Jim questioned the community perception of leaving barrels in the river without doing sampling – they could ask “where did the contamination go”	Jared suggested that we phrase the issue to explain that we would be doing more harm by removing the barrels than by leaving them in place
Jim suggested that we make a good argument up front and let them know what we are proposing, otherwise the issue could come back to haunt us	We should put things in perspective – there are 10000 barrels on site, and approximately 20 will potentially be left in pooled areas of the river
Derrick suggested that we could work around this, if necessary. In a braided system, you may be able to isolate the barrels and present minimal disturbance	
Jim stressed that we make sure people understand what is there and why we’re doing what we are to remove the fear of the unknown	
Bob asked if barrels above the water line are an issue	Derrick said that they are not. The generation of sediments in the water is the issue. Perhaps if the barrels can be removed by hand, they will probably not be an issue at all.
Collette reminded us that Environment Canada 36-3 addresses sediments, so there may be issues there as well	Derrick said that DFO would prefer the barrels be removed instead of left in place, if feasible
Jim said that in-stream work will also have to be included in our application	Chris indicated that we will issue a detailed mitigation plan with our submission
Stephanie suggested that perhaps it could be included as “terms and conditions”	
Collette said that NIRB will want this detailed plan as well	
Bob suggested that we use more photos to illustrate the issue	

Jim suggested that a general overview of our plan for folks to review will be good enough	Derrick, Collette and Stephanie agreed
Collette indicated that not only wildlife but migratory birds could be affected by low-flying aircraft	Chris said there were no birds noted at the site, so this will not be an issue

Comments arising from Jared's slides

Comment	Response
Derrick asked if there are fish in the smaller river that is crossed by the road	Yes, juvenile fish were found Jared indicated that we would need a culvert crossing for the road
Jim said that there are guidelines for in-stream work and asked if we have seen them	Chris says we have them, but Jim will send them to Bob for his reference
Jim asked if any explosives were found at the site	Jared said there were no explosives, but many blasting caps
Jim said that explosives might have been kept on site in order to demolish sensitive buildings in the event that the site fell. If the detonators are commercial in nature, they are probably just left over by a contractor, but if they are military issue, they were probably intended for site demolition	Jared assumes that the explosives were probably for construction of the site, but will follow up.
Natalie asked how much contaminated soil is on site because we have to make sure that we stay on INAC land – should we be moving soil off-site?	We will keep it in mind, but we are assuming we will be disposing of the soil on site due to volumes.
Jim indicated that if we have to move soil off-site it could disrupt our schedule	
Collette suggested that we have 2 different facilities on site	It is possible that we will need 2 or 3 at this site
Natalie feels that we may not dispose of soil on-site, but this will be determined by the input from the communities	
Jim asked what kind of timelines Collette and Derrick need	Collette indicated that sooner is always better since everyone is very busy
	Derrick suggested we have a plan together and ready to include with our submission in January
	Jared reminded everyone that we are not using any new technology and that we are exceeding regulatory requirements
	Derrick said that a “Letter of Advice” may be all that is required from DFO, but an “Authorization” may still be required
	Jim anticipated nothing outside of the community input to impede progress

Bob asked if we should be setting up sub-groups to address specific issues	Chris suggested that he will develop a plan and have it reviewed – if this is not acceptable, then we can go toward forming a group
Bob indicated that he would like to go to interested individuals within the communities as well	Collette anticipates the main issue being the barrels in the river
Derek asked what our plan for handling the wash-outs in the road is	Jared indicated that we are not sure yet, but our final plan is due in December, so we'll know then
	Chris said that the existing road is very near to the stream
Bob would like to avoid going through the letter process	Chris indicated that this is the way we normally work with DFO anyway
	Derek suggested we provide as much detail as possible with our plan so DFO can issue the letter or authorization
Jim and Derrick agreed that stream crossing may be an issue, but to include mitigation plan with our submission to avoid delays	The number of stream crossings won't be as large a concern as the manner in which we intend to mitigate impact
Collette and Derrick were concerned that borrow areas may lie within water	One of the drawings of the site indicates that a borrow area includes areas under water – this was an error, and we will not be using any borrow areas that are under water
Jared indicated that if we use borrow sources that are within Inuit Owned Lands, we will have to pay royalties	Bob said the same will apply for Sarcpa Lake
Collette said that the original application included the potential for waste oil incineration...has any incineration occurred so far?	Jared said that no incineration has happened yet, but will be part of the final plan – this will include residual diesel and non-hazardous waste. So far we anticipate no issues with the incineration
Jim asked if the Federal Facility Discharge Guidelines apply to these sites?	Chris said that we will apply them if that is the requirement
Jim said there will be new discharge guidelines coming out at the municipal level in 3 or 4 years, but no changes as of yet	Bob indicated that he would like to be a part of these evolving guidelines
	Jim said consultations should be occurring in January or February

General Comments

- Spencer suggested that we focus on the positive – we should stress that we are doing a positive thing here by cleaning up these sites, and our activities are posing no threat to the environment. We also should remind everyone that we are exceeding regulatory requirements in our criteria.
- Jared asked if members of the screening boards would be willing to attend ARCCSAC and offer a workshop or seminar informing people about the process and what is required. (Jim will think about

DEW Line Site Clean Up
Regulatory Meeting Notes

it, but he is doubtful that he can attend) At the least, Jared would like the contact names of individuals who may be able to attend.

- Jim commended the group and says that this process has gone well because of the cooperation between stakeholder departments.

Bob thanked everyone for attending and indicated that their comments will be incorporated into our final plan.

Meeting closed at 13:00.