

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 Spagnuola	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

SARCPA LAKE (CAM F) PRESENTATION

Bob went through his introduction

Chris outlined site location, infrastructure, past studies, etc.

Comments arising from Chris's slides

Comment	Response
Jim asked about the plume around the sewer outfall	Yes, there is a plume of some metals and PAHs, but these are typical There are some PCBs left that will have to be cleaned up
Jim asked if all of the asbestos has been removed	Approximately 90% has, but there are still small quantities of both friable and non-friable materials on site – typical materials and small quantities
Derrick asked which water bodies were impacted	The freshwater shore on the west side
Spencer suggested that we clarify elevated levels that may be a result of background – perception of contamination could get out of control	We report them because they are exceedances, even if they are naturally occurring
Jim asked how we know if elevated metals are really background	These are not contaminants we expect to find as a result of DEW Line site activities
Stephanie inquired about the confirmatory PCB sampling conducted after the Queen's work and whether or not it extended to the soil below the area of previous removal	We have not sampled in dumps yet, but we have delineated laterally and vertically in areas of previous removal programs

DEW Line Site Clean Up
Regulatory Meeting Notes

Jim asked what remediation is being planned for the dump areas	Dump A has had previous remediation activities conducted (CEPA and Tier 1 and 2 soils were removed) but the other site was not worked on, so we are assuming and preparing for the worst
Chris asked if Bob was going to be making the investigation report available to interested parties	The final report will be available in PDF, so we could provide CDs Jim suggested that it could be appended, but anticipated that the document was primarily for our use, and that others shouldn't need the whole report
Collette asked if the PCB storage area has been closed	The paperwork to decommission the site has not been done, but the storage facility is empty and sampling results show no traces remaining The intent is to conduct work to decommission the site during the next site visit Natalie suggested that we may want to continue using the site for PCB storage as the materials are removed from the site during the next field season Our intent was to immediately remove PCB materials, but maybe we should consider keeping the site active for future use
Collette asked if all PCB soil has been removed from the Hall Beach storage area	PWGSC was under the impression that it was there for 2 to 3 weeks prior to being mobilized to the Bennet site and undergoing destruction Bob indicated that he just learned that Bennet will not actually be destroying the materials until January
Jen suggested that we clarify the point about the risk of eating fish is equal to background	We have struggled with the wording of this aspect for a while, but we will make it more clear
Spencer suggested that we make it clear that the risk is the same as eating any eastern arctic fish – we really have to watch the wording here as it is an important point that community members are highly interested in	
Natalie offered that we explain that there are no point sources originating from the site	
Bob suggested phrasing it so it is clear that there is no incremental risk	
Jim said that phraseology is extremely important because some people are almost afraid to eat traditional foods, and we must be cautious	
Spencer thinks that the proper terminology for approval to work on Inuit Owned Land is “access permits”	We will follow up

Derrick does not anticipate needing to issue DFO approvals	We will keep in touch to be sure
Spencer suggested that using the term “minor” may not be very wise in referring to other approvals that we require – what to we anticipate?	We may need blasting permits and Hamlet approvals, so we will remove the word “minor” altogether
Derrick indicated that DFO has requirements regarding blasting near water	If we blast, we will be a minimum of 200 m away from water – Chris is pretty sure that we have them, but will get back to Derrick if we need a copy of the DFO guidelines
Jim asked if we are using the same matrix as DCC	Yes, we are following the same process

Comments from Jared’s slides

Comment	Response
Spencer suggested we change the term “reliable” because it sounds like we have doubt in the work we have done	We are trying to say that we want a long term solution even if it is more costly (for example, the triple containment in the proposed engineered landfill) By “reliable” we are trying to say that it exceeds requirements and ensures that we won’t have to go back in the future
Jim said that we should impart to the communities that we are putting forward the Precautionary Principle as our design criteria	Perhaps better terminology would be “proven remedial strategies” rather than “reliable remedial strategies”
Bob indicated that we have the leading people in the field working with us to be sure we are doing the right thing	We will use the word “proven”
Spencer suggested that we should accentuate that we are going above and beyond requirements and criteria – even if it is only in our speaking notes, we need to highlight our “bright spots”	We will focus more on that in the communities
Jim said that metals could pose a problem for bio-remediation, so we may not want to dispose of metal contaminated soils with hydrocarbon contaminated soils	We are not working on a landfarm, rather a soil disposal facility. The intent is not to employ bioremediation. In some areas, this will be looked at as a future prospect, but not in this case
Collette assumes that the “treated wood” we refer to is creosote – what will be the protocol for disposing of this	Yes, it is creosote, but residents in the communities probably will not understand this, so we are using this terminology. We are going to follow the DND protocol.
Stephanie asked if there will be thermistors installed at the landfill locations	Natalie, Jim and Lou confirmed that they are required, and since we are following DND protocol, there will be both thermistors and monitoring well programs

Jim asked if we have incorporated climate change implications in our design	Yes, Bill Horne with EBA has done some modelling and this has shown minimal anticipated impact to the landfills as a result of climate change, but we have incorporated aspects into the design to address this (ex: increased cover material depth)
Jim asked how we are intending to address vegetation	We are also looking at an appropriate medium to bring back mosses and vegetation
	We will not be introducing any non-native species, rather we will be encouraging micro-site development
Jim wondered if we were looking at localized training opportunities – especially because of short time frames, are we organizing a training program to prepare residents (ex: WHMIS, HAZWOPER)	Bob recognizes the need for this training, but a specific plan has not been developed yet. We identified a couple of options such as making it the responsibility of the prime contractor, or to offer it globally as an external portion of the project
	Jared said the INAC HQ has to determine the approach for this issue
Jim indicated that this would benefit the communities, and as it is general training, could spin off into some of the mine activity work occurring in northern areas	Bob and Natalie have to work with their headquarters to establish an approach that is consistent Up front training and development will be site specific, so we want to engage each community in their own area and not bring in people from outside the community if this is possible

Bob concluded the presentation

- we are engaging stakeholders early in the process so comments can be incorporated into regulatory applications
- letters will be sent to community councils for invitations of involvement in January
- significant changes will be forwarded as they occur
- he is looking into an annual audit process to be established

Bob invited questions and comments on the presentation so far

Comment	Response
Stephanie suggested that the 4500 number may not be the best contact because it could be frustrating for people to get connected to the right person	Jen indicated that this is the best line because it is trilingual, and it is the phone number that is supposed to be given out
Collette asked about testing leachate around the dumps	This is not required
Collette asked if soil volumes have been estimated for landfills	The estimates are available in the site investigation report, so she can get a copy of this

Collette asked if a bio-remediation land farm is being considered for a specific site	The landfill sites indicated could also be used as landfarms
Collette asked on behalf of the CWS if migratory birds are being considered in this process	There is not a large number of species outside of ptarmigan at this site, but this is being incorporated into the overall plan
Collette asked if we will be needing another NIRB	Yes, this will happen through the Land Use Permit process
Jared reminded everyone that our timelines are very tight, as we are hoping to go to MERX in February, and we cannot issue a contract until all of the regulatory approvals are in place	Jim said that his office shuts down over Christmas, but Collette said that she is around
Jim indicated that we seem to have covered the environmental aspects very well, but it is important to include socio-economic considerations as we will be evaluated on these as well	We will be sure to clearly state socio-economic issues in our submission as well as environmental
Jim indicated that he is pleased with the cooperation he is receiving and doesn't anticipate any problems with the application	
Bob said that based on comments arising out of last year's work that we are trying to give more time, hopefully submitting applications by the end of the year	Jim said that he is basically at the end of his year now, due to other commitments
	Jared indicated that we only have draft work plans right now, so we probably won't have submissions ready until mid-January
	Jim indicated that this is in line with his needs and anticipates that the water board response will probably not be issued until first of March
	Jared said March should be fine, as May would be our absolute latest for getting approval in time
	Jim reminded us that we can only proceed if there are no concerns with QIA, NCP, etc.
Jim suggested that Bob review the submission, and could provide a checklist if that would be helpful	Bob indicated that he would appreciate a checklist Jim may be in Iqaluit in mid-January to meet and help with the application, but until then we can follow the DCC applications as guidance – just be sure to include socio-economic benefits to the communities as this is as important as the clean up work (Jim is happy with the environmental progress, so we should focus on the socio-economic now)
Spencer indicated that in Bob's introduction "business & work" is listed twice on slide 7, and wildlife isn't mentioned at all	We will make changes

Spencer thinks that the term “sound science” on slide 3 could cause a problem, and should include IQ or traditional knowledge in this regard	Bob indicated that science can promote safety, too Jen suggested that “best practices” might be better, to reflect that we have learned from past experience
Stephanie agreed and said that since most of the work is done on the Precautionary Principle, “sound science” is not appropriate terminology	
Jim offered an instance where traditional knowledge played a major part in driving a project to a review board because it conflicted with the “science” (the elder’s knowledge versus the results of the assessment)	Jared indicated that this is the reason we are presenting options for discussion, so that we can get input
Derrick assumed that since a lot of the plans weren’t finalized that we didn’t know what crossings would be needed	Right, we are still looking at them to determine which option will be chosen
Derrick asked what the water source for remediation activities will be	One of the freshwater lakes near by
Derrick asked if any sewage outfall contacted water	No, it is a dry land outfall about 300 m to the northeast of the site and there is no drainage to worry about
Jim suggested that we be as precise as possible in the estimates of how many cubic meters of water per day will be used, so that amendments can be avoided	Collette said the license now is for 10 cubic meters per day for the assessment activities Jim is concerned about draw-down Jared doesn’t anticipate problems, but recognizes that there will be more water used during the remediation phase than the assessment phase Lou has Resolution Island information that may provide guidance as to the volumes that can be anticipated
Collette would like a final version of the site investigation results	Chris will send something before Christmas – hopefully the final will be ready, but if not he will send a draft

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 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.