

19.0 Borrow Material

- 19.1 DND will attempt to minimize new excavation of borrow materials required for the clean-up activities. Where possible, existing sources of borrow material will be used. All borrow areas will be regraded to match the surrounding topography.

20.0 Monitoring Program

- 20.1 The monitoring program will identify an actual or potential landfill failure. Remedial action will be undertaken if leachate is present at levels greater than the site specific baseline concentrations at the time of the landfill completion. Action taken as result of the monitoring program will ensure the integrity of the landfills and thereby the health of the Inuit is protected on a continuing basis.
- 20.2 Following the completion of the clean-up for a site, DND will commence a monitoring program in accordance with Appendix H of this Agreement.
- 20.3 The monitoring program will have three phases. The objective of each phase are identified in Appendix H.
- 20.4 Monitoring results will be communicated to both Parties in the form of a comprehensive report.

21.0 Research Proposals

- 21.1 NTI, on behalf of communities, may raise at the Steering Committee, items, including the need for hydrographic mapping, which could involve the requirement for research and investigation. These proposals will be discussed and evaluated at the Steering Committee. If the Steering Committee decides that the proposals are consistent with the objective of the clean-up which is to protect the environment from contaminants entering the food chain or involve direct DEW site related impacts which could cause significant economic impact, DND will fund the agreed upon research activities.
- 21.2 Where the proposals are broader in nature and not solely restricted to DND DEW

site activities, DND will support NTI in seeking funding under other Government programs and/or initiatives and may contribute funding to the approved proposals.

- 21.3 Involvement of the Inuit in the research activities including training and technology transfer will be dealt with in an agreement dealing with economic provisions.

22.0 Site Restoration

- 22.1 All sites will be regraded to the extent possible to conform to the natural contours. The regrading will pay particular attention to hydrocarbon stained areas and wherever feasible these areas will be regraded so as to improve the aesthetics of the stained area.

23.0 Site Specific Clean-up Plan

- 23.1 DND will provide NTI with a site specific clean-up plan six months in advance of the clean-up of a particular site. NTI will review the plan to satisfy itself that the plan is in accordance with the requirements as set out in this Agreement. Any items of concern to NTI will be referred to the Steering Committee for resolution in accordance with section 4.3 of the Agreement prior to the issuance of any requests for bids by DCL. DCL, as the representative of the project proponent (DND), will be responsible for preparing all necessary submissions to obtain regulatory approval to proceed with the clean-up activity.

24.0 Liability and Indemnification

- 24.1 DND acknowledges and agrees that it has continuing responsibility and liability for the integrity of all landfills remaining on site. DND agrees that should there be evidence of potential or actual failure of a landfill, it will investigate the situation pursuant to the monitoring provisions of this Agreement.
- 24.2 Should there be evidence of contamination at the DEW Line site which exceeds the protocol as set out in this Agreement at the time of the signing of this Agreement and which cannot be attributed to a third Party then DND will undertake the clean-up.

- 24.3 DND agrees that nothing in this Agreement shall relieve the Crown or its agents either at present or in the future from complying with all applicable federal laws of general application. Changes to territorial law will be referred to the EWG which will make recommendations to the Steering Committee concerning the relevance of these changes to the clean-up.
- 24.4 DND agrees that it will be a condition of any sale or transfer of any of the lands comprising the DEW Line sites that the purchaser must assume DND's obligations under this Agreement with respect to the lands sold or transferred. It will also be a further condition of any such sale or transfer that the purchaser or transferee shall provide security for the performance of the assumed obligation and shall provide and maintain a letter of credit, surety bond, or other security in a form and amount mutually agreeable to the Parties.
- 25.0 **Amendments**
- 25.1 Should existing federal regulations or guidelines be amended, the EWG will examine the implementation of these changes or amendments taking account the special characteristics of the Arctic environment and make appropriate recommendations to the Steering Committee in accordance with section 4.3 of this Agreement.
- 25.2 The Protocol for confirmatory testing may be reviewed and adjusted on a site by site basis provided that a majority of the EWG are in agreement with the changes. Permanent or major changes will require the prior approval of the Steering Committee.
- 25.3 In the event that either Party wishes to amend the schedule as set out in Appendix A, it will provide the other Party with thirty (30) months written notice. If unforeseen event(s) or a decision by a regulatory body occurs which has a material impact on this schedule, the Parties will review these events and attempt to arrive at a mutually acceptable alternative.
- 25.4 Both Parties agree to review changes in technology and research studies which may have a bearing on this Agreement and discuss the need for changes resulting from these developments. The Steering Committee may task the EWG to investigate a particular technology pursuant to clause 4.1 (d) of this Agreement.

Recommendations of the EWG will be implemented in accordance with section 4.3.

25.5 If either Party wishes to make other changes to this Agreement, it will provide, in writing, six months notice of proposed changes. Any agreed upon amendments will be executed and attached as an appendix to this Agreement.

25.6 DND and NTI agree to consider amendments in an expeditious manner, particularly where the proposed amendments directly affects the conduct of a clean-up in progress or one which is scheduled to commence in the near term.

26.0 EWG Reports

26.1 All reports of the EWG will be available to provide additional information and guidance in the implementation of this Agreement. In the event of any conflicts or differences in interpretation of the EWG reports and this Agreement, this Agreement will prevail.

27.0 Notices

27.1 Where any Party is obliged or entitled to give any notice, request, approval, demand, consent, direction or other communication (ie Notice) to the other Party, such party shall first communicate the substance thereof personally or by telephone. However, such Notice shall not be sufficiently given until sent in writing to the addressees at the address below. Any Notice may be personally delivered or sent by registered mail or telefacimile and will be effective upon receipt by the addressee.

27.2 Notices to DND will be sent to:

Director General Environment
National Defence Headquarters
101 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0K2

27.3 Notices to NTI will be sent to:

1st Vice President
Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
Box 1041
Cambridge Bay
Northwest Territories
X0E 0C0

28.0 Termination of the Agreement

28.1 This Agreement will terminate on the later of December 31st, 2008 or when the clean-up work as set out in this Agreement for the sites listed in Appendix A is completed or on such a date agreed to by the Parties in accordance with clause 25.3 of this Agreement.

28.2 Notwithstanding clause 28.1 of this Agreement, monitoring and any necessary remediation in accordance with section 20 of this Agreement will continue for twenty five (25) years after the termination of this Agreement.

28.3 At the end of twenty five years of monitoring following the termination of this Agreement, DND and NTI will negotiate a new agreement to specify the terms of any further monitoring (if required).

Annexes to the Agreement

Appendix A

Clean-up Schedule

Site*		Start Date	Completion Date
CAM M	Cambridge Bay	1998	1999
FOX 5**	Broughton Island	2001	2003
CAM 4**	Pelly Bay	2001	2003
FOX M/CAM 5	Hall Beach/Maclar Inlet	2002	2006
CAM 3	Shepard Bay	2002	2003
DYE M	Cape Dyer	2003	2006
CAM 2	Gladman Point	2003	2004
FOX 2/FOX 3	Longstaff Bluff/Dewar Lakes	2004	2008
CAM 1	Jenny Lind Island	2004	2005
PIN 4	Byron Bay	2005	2006
PIN 3	Lady Franklin Point	2006	2007
PIN 2	Cape Young	2007	2008

Dates for the Baffin Sites are tentative pending resolution of economic and business issues

** The starting dates for CAM 4 and Fox 5 and the subsequent starting dates could be moved up pending the timing of the PCBs in paint decision by Environment Canada

Appendix B

Environmental Risk Assessment Matrix

Introduction

The matrix has been based on the CCME National Classification System for Contaminated Sites, and adapted to address the particular concerns of the Arctic environment. The matrix is divided into three categories of equal weight: contaminated source, pathways, and receptors. The interaction of these three elements results in environmental risk. Each category is assigned 50 points, which are distributed among several factors. Each of these factors has been made as specific as possible in order to reduce the subjectivity of the matrix to a minimum. In addition, each of the three main categories is assigned a highly subjective "special considerations" factor according to the method described in the CCME Classification System. As it is unlikely that any classification system could address all possible factors, a special considerations factor allows the user to increase or decrease the score "to emphasize important concerns about a site and should be used as an exception rather than as a rule" (CCME 1992, p.6-7).

The purpose of the matrix is to evaluate the environmental risk posed by landfills in their current condition and location. It is not suitable for determining the risk posed by a landfill post-closure, as most of the elements in the matrix would not change by the application of a remedial solution. It should also be recognized that monitoring is an integral part of the closure.

The next sections provide guidance to the EWG on the methodology and items to be considered when scoring the matrix. This section is followed by the actual matrix which is to be used in the scoring.

A. Contaminant Source

Five factors were considered under Contaminant Source to describe specific landfills, as follows:

- A.1 Landfill Extent
- A.2 Estimated Depth of Landfill
- A.3 Presence of Leachate
- A.4 Presence of Surface Contaminated Soil
- A.5 Presence of Surface Debris

A.1 Landfill Extent

Landfill areas will be based on the results of geotechnical/geophysical site surveys and visual observations. Those landfills with an area greater than 10,000 square metres will score 10 and those smaller landfills will be scored in proportion to their size relative to 10,000 square metres.

A.2 Estimated Depth

The estimated depth of a landfill is determined by visual inspection of surrounding topographic features. The average depth of the active layer will be used as a qualifier for the description of landfill depth, as this is generally the maximum depth of investigation. The depth of the active layer may range from one to two meters at these sites, depending on material type; therefore an average depth of 1.5 meters was used in the rating. Landfills with estimated depths of greater than 1.5 meters will score 5 and those with estimated depths of less than 1.5 meters will score less.

A.3 Presence of Leachate

Leachate provides evidence of contamination within landfill. Leachate can be defined as the presence of contaminants in water emanating from the landfill, but concentrations may be so low as to be difficult to detect. The presence of leachate can be better determined by the presence of contaminated soil at the toe of the landfill, indicating

chronic low levels of contaminants leaching from the landfill. All types of contaminants in leachate (PCBs, (Polychlorinated Biphenyls) TPH (Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons) or inorganics) are considered to be of equal concern, as indicators of contamination within the landfill.

In the scoring, leachate is considered to be either present or not; no interpolation of the score is used in this category.

A.4 Surface contaminated soil

Within each landfill, there is potentially a source of contamination. The presence of surface contaminated soil, like the presence of leachate, is an indication that the landfill contains contamination. The volume of contaminated soil is not taken into consideration; this provides a conservative approach in that a small amount of contaminated soil can trigger a high score. The presence of Tier II soils will trigger the highest score (15). Based on the hypothesis that each landfill potentially contains contaminants, 5 points are given to this subsection, even if no surface contaminated soils were identified.

A.5 Presence of surface debris

At some landfills surface debris is very extensive, while at others there is almost no debris. Scoring needs to be quantitative; therefore the percentage of the surface area of the landfill that is covered with debris is used as the basis for scoring. A landfill that has surface debris covering more than 50% of its surface receives a full score.

B. Pathways

The primary transport mechanisms for contaminants from the DEW Line landfills are considered to be:

- aerial transport of fine particles; and
- water transport, both as surface water run-off or subsurface water flow.

B.1 Aerial Transport of Contaminants

All contaminants can be transported as particles; windblown debris is not considered in this category, as debris pickup is inherent in any cleanup. Surface contamination or surface expressions of leachate imply the potential for aerial transport. This factor is given a low weight because the quantity of contaminated soil on the surface of a landfill is generally low relative to the quantity of contaminated soil at the site as a whole. In addition, it is anticipated that relative to the effect of water movement, aerial transport contributes less to the transport of contaminants away from a landfill.

B.2 Water Movement

Water movement includes the movement of surface water and subsurface water within the active layer. "Groundwater" is not addressed as an issue separate from surface water as the movement of water within the active layer is subject to the same driving forces as surface water. The intent of this sub-category is to examine factors that affect migration away from the landfill – slope, runoff, extent and type of cover on the landfill, annual precipitation and distance to surface water. Among these factors, topography, runoff potential and proximity to surface water are given the highest weight.

B.2.1 Topography

The degree of the slope on which the landfill is located is one of the major factors contributing to transport of contaminants; the scoring is carried out on a sliding scale. In cases where there are different slopes across the landfill, a weighted average is used.

B.2.2 Cover Material – Depth

The extent to which potential contaminants are available to transport is also dependent on the depth and type of cover material. The potential for leachate generation and correspondingly, leachate migration, is related to the infiltration of water into the landfill. Cover over the landfill helps mitigate infiltration of water into the landfill contents. As the thickness of the landfill cover increases, the likelihood that potential contaminants will be released from the landfill decreases. If the active layer is contained in the cover material above the debris, then the potential for surface water infiltration into the landfill is small; this circumstance is assigned the lowest score.

B.2.3 Cover Material – Type

The erosion potential of a landfill is partly based on the type of cover material. Erosion can eventually lead to the exposure of the landfill contents. Some cover materials are more susceptible to erosion than others; well graded gravels are the least susceptible, and silty materials are the most susceptible. In cases where there is no cover, this factor is assigned the highest score. Where the cover materials consist of a combination of soil types, the scoring should reflect the more conservative or higher score.

B.2.4 Surface Water/Run-Off Potential

This factor aims to describe the destructive potential of water action on the landfill, which could take the form of waves; streams, rivers or lakes; or seasonal drainage. Where there is significant seasonal drainage, the run-off potential is high. "Significant seasonal drainage" is defined as run-off that has the potential to transport large quantities and concentrations of contaminants to surface water courses over a short period of time (CCME 1992, p.23). Significant seasonal drainage also includes consideration of major snow drifting on a landfill.

B.2.5 Precipitation

The amount of precipitation received, either as rain or snow fall, affects the amount of surface water infiltration or run-off. The majority of the DEW Line sites receive less than 500 mm of precipitation annually, with the exception of Cape Dyer. Typically, the amount of precipitation at any site is relatively low; therefore it is unlikely that any single precipitation event would cause significant runoff. This factor is therefore given a relatively low weight.

B.2.6 Distance to Downgradient Perennial Surface Water/Seasonal Drainage Channel

The distance to surface water will affect the probability of contaminants reaching the watercourse. This factor can include streams, seasonal or perennial, running directly through the landfill, or streams and lakes downgradient from the landfill, but it is intended to exclude small ponds with no outflow. On very steep slopes this distance should consider the horizontal distance to the water body rather than the vertical drop. The impact of drainage with respect to contaminant exposure is not considered in this category (it is considered under Receptors); this factor determines whether there is a drainage pathway from the landfill.

C. Receptors

This section addresses the potential for impact on receptors, specifically, aquatic and terrestrial habitats, as well as human exposure. Impact on humans is the primary consideration; however, it should be recognized that impact on humans is implicit in the scoring of factors addressing ecosystem impact. The scoring within each category is to be based on recorded data, as well as local knowledge of the land use in the area, and therefore requires local input.

C.1 Potential Impact on Receiving Freshwater/Marine Habitat

The water body should be selected based on the potential effects on the receiving habitat. In the selection of the receiving water body to be used in the landfill evaluation matrix, consideration must be given to the regional drainage patterns. For example, where the drainage from a landfill is overland (i.e. there is no direct connection between the landfill and the downgradient water body), water bodies beyond 2 kilometers should not be used in the evaluation. This is based on the premise that natural attenuation of any potential contamination will occur with overland flow. Where a direct connection between a landfill and a downgradient water body exists, via a stream or interconnected ponds, the two-kilometre limit should not be used.

C.1.1 Proximity to Receiving Freshwater/Marine Habitat

“Receiving habitat” is considered to be the most potentially impacted significant body of water near the toe of the landfill. The water body may support freshwater or marine life and/or may be used by avifauna and/or terrestrial mammals as a water source. It is not necessarily the seasonal drainage course or perennial water body closest to the landfill toe. This section’s objective is to select a habitat which support receptors rather than identify the closest body of water. It is assumed that only habitat downgradient from the landfill is to be considered (given that aerial transport of contaminants to habitat upgradient from the landfill will be addressed by the remediation of contaminated soil).

C.1.2 Estimated Habitat Usage – Freshwater/Marine

This section is scored based on the frequency of usage within the selected receiving water body: the level of biodiversity and the occurrence of calving/spawning should be considered in scoring. It is recognized that freshwater and/or marine wildlife is potentially more at risk compared with terrestrial wildlife or avifauna, which should only be exposed through water ingestion. Thus, when terrestrial wildlife or avifauna is the primary receptor, the score for this factor should fall into the moderate or low category based on the potential frequency of usage. Otherwise, when the selected water body sustains freshwater and/or marine wildlife, the level of biodiversity should be used to evaluate the score. It should be noted that the most conservative approach - in the selection of the receiving water body - must be used when scores from section C.1.1 and C.1.2 are combined. Finally, "Biologically sensitive" areas such as bird sanctuaries and/or endangered, threatened or vulnerable populations should be considered as "special considerations".

C.2 Potential Impact on Receiving Terrestrial Habitat

C.2.1 Extent of Vegetation

Typically the area in which to consider vegetation would include an area 300 m downgradient from the toe of the landfill. The area within this distance is expected to be most susceptible to uptake of contaminants if they are leaching from the landfill, but a larger or smaller area could be considered if site specific conditions warrant it.

C.2.2 Estimated Habitat Usage – Terrestrial/Avifauna

The same criteria as for usage of aquatic habitat are to be applied.

C.3 Potential Human Exposure Through Land Use

C.3.1 Presence/Occupation

This factor addresses strictly dermal exposure and inhalation; consumption of food and water from the area is dealt with in subsequent factors. The risk of dermal exposure or inhalation is much lower when soil is frozen; therefore winter occupation of the site is assigned a low risk. "Summer" in this factor is intended to include the spring, summer and fall periods when the ground is not frozen. Within this factor, the scoring takes into account the likelihood and the duration of contact. In such way, proximity to a community is considered (high likelihood of contact), although proximity to a community does not necessarily trigger a high score if visits are infrequent (low duration of contact).

The likelihood of contact considers proximity to community or to a camp, as well as proximity to "travel routes". The duration of contact considers full time residences (i.e. permanent community for high, summer camp for moderate, winter camp or travel routes as low). Scores may be interpolated between the allocated points, according to the table below.

Table 1-1: Scoring Guide for Section C.3.1

	High Likelihood of Contact	Moderate Likelihood of Contact	Low Likelihood of Contact
High Duration of Contact	8	6	4
Moderate Duration of Contact	6	4	2
Low Duration of Contact	4	2	1

For large DEW Line sites, different parts of the site need to be considered individually, as some areas of the site could be quite far (more than a few kilometres) from the landfill under consideration.

C.3.2 Proximity to Drinking Water Source

Regardless of whether the source is seasonal or perennial, an established community or a summer camp water source located downgradient of the landfill is to be considered in this factor.

C.3.3 Food Consumption

Sedentary organisms are more susceptible to local inputs as their exposure is large if they are downgradient from the landfill. These organisms can include bottom-dwellers such as sculpins, mussels, sea urchins etc., as well as terrestrial vegetation, which can be used for medicinal purposes. This kind of contamination "is quite localized when considered on a broad regional scale" (DIAND 1997, pg. 5). Migratory marine animals may have body burdens of contaminants; these are not directly attributable to local contaminant sources, as the vast majority of organochlorines, for instance, arrive in the Arctic via long range transport.

Caribou living in the general area of DEW Line sites do not have elevated levels of contaminants, since they feed over a very wide area. The Canadian Arctic Contaminant Assessment Report (DIAND, 1997) describes these results in more detail.

It is recognized, however, that sources such as DEW Line sites do contribute contaminants to the Arctic ecosystem. For the purpose of scoring the matrix, therefore, a high consumption of animals from the area surrounding the DEW Line sites has the potential to pose a higher risk than a low consumption, **although in general the risk remains low.**

This factor is divided into two sub-sections, and the score is the sum of the score for each of the two sub-sections.

1.3 Special Considerations

As indicated in the introduction to the matrix (section 1.1), each of the three main categories includes a “*special considerations*” factor. The proposed value of the special considerations factor is a maximum of ten percent of the overall score for each category. It is intended that no circumstance will allow a user to assign a special considerations score that will cause the score for that category to exceed the maximum allotted. To avoid undue bias, it is also suggested that the user should complete the entire evaluation form and score a site before addressing special considerations in the total score.

The Environmental Working Group (EWG) based the landfill risk evaluation matrix on the CCME model which defines three categories: contaminant source, pathways and receptors. Within those three categories, the EWG tried to address all of the possible factors contributing to risk. Recognizing that even a thorough matrix could never address all possible risk factors, special considerations were included to address specific risk factors, which are not general to all of the DEW Line sites.

As noted in the CCME document, the special considerations factor is not intended to be applied on a regular basis, as it addresses very site-specific risk factors. In fact, if the special consideration factor was being consistently applied in the scoring of landfills, it would indicate that the matrix itself was incomplete. Special considerations should be site-specific characteristics that can be documented.

Three examples of how special considerations could be applied are provided to clarify the use of such a classification:

Example 1. Wildlife on site

At Byron Bay, the caribou belong to the Peary herd, an endangered species. It may be that “special considerations” points would be assigned to the Receptors category when endangered, threatened and/or vulnerable species (COSEWIC, 1997) are known to visit the DEW Line landfill.

Example 2. Drinking water

The risk associated with landfill impact on a drinking water source is addressed in section C.3.2. In that section, the distance from a landfill to a known drinking water source, permanent or seasonal, is used as an indicator of the risk that the contaminants in the landfill could have an impact on the drinking water source. If a landfill is close to a drinking water source, then section C.3.2 would be assigned the maximum score (8 points). In the case of Pelly Bay, however, where the landfills are far from the drinking water source and therefore receive a relatively low score in section C.3.2, "special considerations" points may be added to address concerns that the landfills are located in the watershed for the community drinking water supply.

Example 3. Proximity to a community

In the landfill risk evaluation matrix, human exposure to a landfill is measured in the following way: people can spend time at the landfill (potential dermal exposure), they can drink water from an area near the landfill (potential ingestion), they could live very close to landfills (potential exposure through aerial transport) or they could eat animals that feed near the landfill (potential ingestion). These three considerations form section C.3 of the risk evaluation matrix. If a landfill is located near a community, there is a greater likelihood that people will spend time at the landfill than there is for landfills far from a community. It is not necessarily the case, however, that landfills near communities receive frequent visits; therefore, instead of creating a special section addressing proximity to a community, the risk of human exposure (section C.3.1) is more accurately evaluated by measuring time spent at a landfill. In these cases, however, "special considerations" points may be added to the Receptors category to address a community's specific concerns.