



Abandoned Military Site Remediation Protocol



Volume I – Main Report

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
Northern Affairs Organization
Contaminated Sites Program

Final
December 2008



Abandoned Military Site Remediation Protocol

Volume I – Main Report

December 2008

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Protocol is an update on the previous Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) Abandoned Military Site Remediation Protocol, which was produced in 2005. Considerable intellectual effort has gone into the revisions and updates contained in this new Protocol and INAC wishes to recognize and thank the organizations involved in its development.

This document, which is comprised of Volume I (Main Report) and Volume II (Supporting Technical Documentation) is a product of the collaborative efforts by the following organizations:

- Environmental Sciences Group, Royal Military College of Canada
- Golder Associates Ltd.
- EBA Engineering Consultants Ltd.
- UMA Engineering Ltd. (now AECOM)
- Qikiqtaaluk Environmental Inc.
- Jacques Whitford Ltd.
- Dept. of Geological Sciences and Geological Engineering, Queen's University

INAC also wishes to recognize and thank the members of the Technical Advisory Working Group who provided invaluable input to development of this Protocol.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Scope of Document	3
2	BACKGROUND.....	4
2.1	CCME Environmental Quality Guidelines.....	4
2.2	Department of National Defence (DND) DEW Line Cleanup (DLCU) Protocol.....	5
3	CLEANUP OBJECTIVES	8
3.1	Biophysical Environment	9
4	ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL	10
4.1	Background Geo-Chemical Assessment.....	11
4.2	Contaminated Soils.....	11
4.2.1	Inorganic Elements and PCBs – DCC Criteria	11
4.2.2	Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soils	14
4.3	Solid Waste Disposal Areas.....	18
4.4	Surface Debris	19
4.5	Submerged Debris	20
4.6	Buildings/Structure Inventory	20
4.7	Geotechnical Requirements	21
4.7.1	Potential Development Areas	21
4.7.2	Borrow Sources.....	22
4.7.3	Site Access.....	22
4.7.4	Siting of Camp Facilities and Temporary Storage areas.....	23
4.8	Potable Water Supply	23
4.9	Natural Environment Assessment.....	23
4.9.1	Regional and Local Setting.....	23
4.9.2	Local Ecosystems	24
4.9.3	Species Assemblage.....	24
4.9.4	Impacts and Mitigation	24
4.10	Traditional Knowledge Surveys/Assessment	24
4.10.1	Typical TK and Local Knowledge.....	25
4.11	Archaeological Assessment.....	26
5	REMEDIATION PROTOCOL	27
5.1	Contaminated Soils.....	28
5.2	Debris – Site Debris and Demolition Wastes	29
5.2.1	Submerged Debris.....	30
5.2.2	Barrels.....	31
5.2.3	Buildings and Infrastructure	32
5.3	Solid Waste Disposal Area (WDA) Closure.....	32
5.4	Landfill Development.....	33
5.4.1	Non-Hazardous Waste Landfill	33
5.4.2	Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill	34
5.5	Borrow Source Development	36
5.5.1	Site Grading	36
5.6	Contractor Support Activities	36



6	CONSTRUCTION RELATED IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.....	38
6.1	Confirmatory Testing Contaminated Soils	38
6.1.1	Tier I contaminated soils.....	39
6.1.2	Tier II contaminated soils	39
6.1.3	Hazardous Soils	39
6.1.4	Type B TPH (Fractions F1 to F3).....	40
6.1.5	Ex-situ Confirmatory Sampling.....	40
6.1.6	Confirmatory Sampling of Material Processing Areas	42
6.2	Quality Assurance Testing of Earthworks	42
6.3	Testing Related to Permits/Regulatory Requirements.....	43
7	POST-CONSTRUCTION MONITORING	44
7.1	Introduction	44
7.2	Monitoring Program	44
7.2.1	Baseline Geo-Chemical Monitoring	44
7.2.2	Natural Environment Monitoring	46
7.2.3	Landfill Monitoring	47
7.3	Specific Monitoring Requirements.....	48
7.3.1	Visual Inspection	48
7.3.2	Groundwater Sampling	48
7.3.3	Thermal Monitoring.....	49
7.3.4	Soil Sampling.....	50
7.4	Monitoring Frequency	50
7.5	Interpreting Monitoring Results	51
7.6	Reporting Format.....	51
8	REFERENCES.....	53
	ANNEX A – DUMP SITE, LANDFILL AND DEBRIS AREA (WASTE DISPOSAL AREA – WDA) EVALUATION	57
1	INTRODUCTION.....	59
2	MATRIX FACTORS	60
2.1	Contaminant Source – Category A.....	60
2.2	Pathways – Category B.....	61
2.3	Receptors – Category C.....	64
2.4	Special Considerations	67
2.5	Traditional Knowledge	68
3	INTERPRETATION OF SCORES.....	69
4	REFERENCES.....	71
	ANNEX B – BARREL PROTOCOL	78
1	INTRODUCTION.....	79
2	INSPECTION.....	79
3	SAMPLING.....	80



4	TESTING	80
5	DISPOSAL OF BARREL CONTENTS	81
6	DISPOSAL OF BARRELS	83
7	PERSONNEL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT	83



List of Tables		Page No.
Table 2.1	Summary of INAC Military Sites and Historic Land Use	6
Table 4.1	DEW Line Cleanup Criteria (DCC) for Soil ^a	12
Table 4.2	Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil Information Requirements	16
Table 5.1	Summary of Remedial Options – Contaminated Soil.....	28
Table 5.2	Barrel Protocol Criteria and Disposal Summary.....	31
Table 5.3	Decision Criteria Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill	34
Table 6.1	Confirmatory Testing Grid Sizes	39
Table 6.2	Analytical Requirements for Stockpile Sampling.....	42
Table 7.1	Summary of Landfill Monitoring Requirements	47
Table 7.2	Visual Inspection Requirements - Landfills.....	48

List of Figures		Page No.
Figure 1	Location of INAC Military Sites	2
Figure 2	Steps for Addressing a Contaminated Site.....	3



1 INTRODUCTION

In the 1950s, at the height of the Cold War, a number of facilities were constructed in the Canadian Arctic to provide surveillance of northern approaches to the continent. The largest installation was the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line, a series of radar stations spanning the northern coastline from Alaska to Greenland. In total, 63 stations were constructed, 42 of which were located in Canada. In 1963, due to advances in technology, installations at 21 of the sites were considered redundant and these sites were abandoned. All buildings, vehicles, Petroleum Oil Lubricant (POL) storage tanks and miscellaneous debris were left in place. Administration of these sites was transferred to Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) (Fletcher 1989; INAC 2002). Other abandoned military sites include those associated with the Pole Vault line in the eastern Arctic. Locations of INAC military sites in the Canadian Arctic are indicated on Figure 1. The remainder of the installations on the DEW Line continued to operate until the early 1990s, at which point most of them were converted to the North Warning System (NWS). Decommissioning and cleanup of these 21 sites, excluding facilities that are required for the operation of the NWS, is the responsibility of the Department of National Defence (DND).

Several environmental issues were at these abandoned military sites based on previous preliminary and detailed assessments at the INAC and DND sites (ESG 1991, 1993). These issues include physical hazards related to unconsolidated debris and aged structures, and environmental impacts associated with soil contamination. In 1996, DND initiated remediation of the DEW Line sites under its jurisdiction and cleanup of these sites is on going. The cleanup follows the conditions of the DEW Line Cleanup Protocol (ESG, 1993 and ESG/UMA, 1995) and the co-operation agreements between DND and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. (NTI) (DGE 1998) and DND and the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC) (DGE 1996).

INAC has completed the remediation of a number of sites across the Canadian Arctic namely Iqaluit Upper Base, Resolution Island (BAF-5), Horton River (BAR-E), Sarcpa Lake (CAM-F), and Pearce Point (PIN-A). The approach adopted for remediation of these sites has generally been consistent with the methodology applied at the DND DEW sites (PWGSC 2001 to 2003). Due to the commitment of the Federal Government to future funding of contaminated site clean up, INAC recognizes the need for a consistent protocol for abandoned military site cleanup (INAC 2002).

A number of factors must be considered when determining the most suitable approach to site remediation for remote sites in the Arctic environment. The Abandoned Military Site Remediation Protocol (AMSRP) is based on an approach that addresses legal requirements, INAC's Contaminated Sites Policy (including risk management requirements), and standard environmental management practices (INAC 2002).

This Protocol also takes into consideration financially prudent methodologies that address environmental issues while striking a balance with remedial cost. An over-arching principle has been to balance the environmental benefits of remediation activities with potential negative physical impacts to the Arctic environment.



The primary objectives of this document are to provide sufficient background information to understand the environmental issues present at these sites, and to describe the guiding principles for their assessment and remediation. AMSRP, Volume 2 (INAC 2008) provides additional supporting technical information.

Indian & Northern Affairs Canada INAC Contaminated Sites Program





Figure 1 Location of INAC Military Sites



1.1 Scope of Document

This document is structured in a manner generally consistent with the steps outlined in the Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan (CSM 2000) as shown in Figure 2. As previously indicated, issues of environmental concern have been identified at the INAC DEW Lines (Step 1). Extensive historical data (Steps 2 and 3) from initial environmental assessments, as well as detailed information collected through assessment of DEW sites under the jurisdiction of DND, has been used to develop the requirements for the detailed assessment of the INAC sites (Step 5), as described in Section 4. Guidelines for development of a remediation strategy (Step 7) are provided in Section 5. Implementation related issues, such as confirmatory sampling, waste manifesting, construction quality assurance/quality control measures (Step 9) are described in Section 6. Post-implementation monitoring requirements are described in Section 7 (Step 10).

Steps for Addressing a Contaminated Site



NOTE: The steps shown above illustrate the complete process involved in dealing with contaminated sites. There will be instances where some of the steps may not be required.

Figure 2 Steps for Addressing a Contaminated Site



2 BACKGROUND

2.1 CCME Environmental Quality Guidelines

Where remediation of federal real property is carried out, departments and agencies are to set remediation objectives in accordance with the most applicable of the three methods developed by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) (CCME 1997):

CCME Tier 1: Follow CCME Environmental Quality Guidelines (CCME 1997, 1999), as amended from time to time, and, where applicable, the *Canada-wide Standard for Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Soil* (CCME 2008), as amended from time to time. To the extent that guidelines do not exist for a particular type of contamination, or are technically or economically inappropriate for a particular situation, departments and agencies may follow equivalent guidelines or standards (e.g. provincial);

CCME Tier 2: Follow modified CCME Environmental Quality Guidelines where site conditions, land use, receptors, or exposure pathways differ only slightly from the protocols used in the development of the guidelines; and

CCME Tier 3: Develop site-specific remediation objectives based on a site-specific risk assessment, as outlined by the CCME, or equivalent, where site conditions are unique or particularly sensitive.

Although the CCME Environmental Quality Guidelines are broad in application and address a wide variety of land uses and potential contaminants from diverse sources, they do not specifically address the environmental conditions representative of the Arctic, as discussed in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008).



2.2 Department of National Defence (DND) DEW Line Cleanup (DLCU) Protocol

The initial environmental assessment of DEW Line sites under the jurisdiction of DND was one of the first major contaminant investigations in the Arctic related to point source contaminants. Following these assessments in the early 1990s, DND developed a remedial protocol in consultation with other government agencies and stakeholders (ESG 1991, 1993), and referred to it as the DEW Line Cleanup (DLCU) Protocol. This Protocol was developed at a time when no remediation standards and criteria specific to the Canadian Arctic existed. The remedial criteria were developed using a contaminant source and pathway targeted approach, consistent with CCME's Tier 3 method. A broad suite of chemicals was investigated and contaminants of concern at DEW Line sites were identified as those contaminants that were consistently elevated relative to the site background levels and the available Canadian federal or provincial guidelines (CCME 1991). The rationale for selection of contaminants of concern is provided in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008). Engineering input with respect to remediation strategies was used to refine the cleanup protocol (ESG/UMA 1995) prior to its implementation at the first DND sites in 1996.

Cleanup of Arctic sites presents a number of unique challenges, including but not limited to:

- Remote site location, with access limited to sea-lift and small aircraft during the summer months, and over-land during winter;
- Short construction season, typically from July to September, which may limit the technical feasibility of remedial options;
- Lack of centralized waste disposal facilities;
- High costs associated with mobilization of equipment and personnel to the sites, both during the site assessment and remedial phases; and
- Sensitivity of the Arctic ecosystem to changes in physical habitat.

Experience gained since 1996 at the DND sites has been reviewed annually to evaluate lessons learned and to incorporate new information and methodologies as they become available. The DLCU protocol therefore is the culmination of scientific and engineering expertise that has been applied across the Arctic at the DND sites.

Although there are many similarities between INAC and DND DEW sites, the INAC sites were in operation for a significantly shorter period of time, and environmental issues tend to differ in scale. In addition, there may have been other land use subsequent to the DEW Line activities. INAC sites and the associated known land uses are summarized in Table 2.1



Table 2.1 Summary of INAC Military Sites and Historic Land Use

Site Designation/Name	Location	Other Historic Land Use/ or Issues
BAR-C Tununuk Camp	NWT	Imperial Oil as Lessee
BAR-D, Atkinson Point	NWT	Canadian Marine Drilling (CANMAR) Canadian Reindeer Ltd. (note: cleanup on-going)
BAR-E Horton River	NWT	SRR, (note: cleanup completed, monitoring on-going)
PIN-A Pearce Point	NWT	Biological Research Station (note: cleanup completed, monitoring ongoing)
PIN-B Clifton Point	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	
PIN-C Bernard Harbour	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	
PIN-D Ross Point	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	
PIN-E Cape Peel	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	
CAM-A Sturt Point	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	
CAM-B Hat Island	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	Short Range Radar (SRR) as part of North Warning System
CAM-C Matheson Point	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	
CAM-D Simpson Lake	Nunavut/Kitikmeot	SRR (module train gone)
CAM-E Keith Bay	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Module train gone/some evidence of burning
CAM-F Sarcpa Lake	Nunavut/ Qikiqtaaluk	Research Station (note: cleanup completed, monitoring ongoing)
FOX-1 Rowley Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	SRR (large burn area, module train gone)
FOX-A Bray Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	SRR (module train gone)
FOX-B Nudluardjuk Lake	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	SRR (module train gone)
FOX-C Ekalugad Fiord	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	
FOX-D Kivitoo	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Fire destroyed main building train in 1963
FOX-E Durban Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Partially burned building



Site Designation/Name	Location	Other Historic Land Use/ or Issues
Cape Christian	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	LORAN Site
Padloping Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Navigational aid and weather station
Radio Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Navigational aid and weather station (note: cleanup completed, monitoring ongoing)
Akpatok Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Exploratory oil well drilling in the 1970s
Bear Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Mid-Canada site
BAF-5 Resolution Island	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Pole-Vault site (note: cleanup completed, monitoring ongoing)
Iqaluit, Upper Base	Nunavut/Qikiqtaaluk	Pole-Vault site (note: cleanup completed, monitoring ongoing)

Cleanup objectives were set for the INAC sites, and the INAC AMSRP was developed as outlined in the following sections.



3 CLEANUP OBJECTIVES

Cleanup objectives, which are consistent with the Federal Contaminated Sites Management Working Group (CSMWG) objective to “integrate sustainable development and pollution prevention principles while meeting environmental regulations and protecting public health” (CSM 2000, TB 1998, 2000, 2002), are as follows:

- To restore sites to meet the environmental objectives established for northern sites;
- To prevent migration of contaminants into the Arctic ecosystem;
- To remove physical hazards for the protection of human health and safety; and
- To implement a cost effective remediation solution.

These objectives are consistent with those applied in the remediation of DEW Line sites under the jurisdiction of DND (DGE 1996, 1998). The following considerations need to be taken into account when developing and implementing a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) for INAC sites:

- Respect all historical agreements and obligations in a fair and reasonable manner;
- Ensure consistency with federal guidelines for management of contaminated sites;
- Apply the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) environmental protection and management approaches (CCME 1996, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2008) as applicable;
- Apply simple, practical remedial solutions wherever possible, with flexibility as necessary to adjust to site-specific conditions when they are identified;
- Establish cost effective solutions through use of best practices to ensure appropriate levels of environmental protection for all sites;
- Recognize the concerns of climate change in an Arctic setting; and
- Ensure long-term effectiveness of the environmental remedial measures.

It is Canadian government policy that all federal departments and agencies ensure sound environmental stewardship with respect to property in their care by avoiding contamination and managing contaminated sites in a consistent and systematic manner that recognizes the principle of risk management and results in the best value for the Canadian taxpayer (TB 1998, 2000, 2002). The following section identifies the primary factors that have been considered in developing a remediation approach.



3.1 Biophysical Environment

The INAC abandoned military sites are located across the Arctic in the Southern Arctic Ecozone in the western Arctic, in the Northern Arctic Ecozone in the central and eastern Arctic, and the Arctic Cordillera along the east coast of Baffin Island. The majority of the sites are located along the coastline. (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 1996).

Mean annual temperatures are in the range of -11°C in the western Arctic and tend to be colder in the central and eastern Arctic. Accordingly, all sites are located within the zone of continuous permafrost. Much of the Arctic region is classified as polar desert as annual precipitation, predominantly as snow, is generally within the range of 100 to 300 mm. One exception is the eastern coastline of Baffin Island near Cumberland Peninsula, where precipitation can be in the order of 400 to 600 mm annually.

As indicated, the Arctic ecosystem is characterized by extreme environmental conditions, including cold temperatures, large seasonal fluctuations in incoming solar radiation, extensive snow and ice cover, and short growing seasons. These conditions affect the productivity, species diversity, wildlife behaviour (e.g., migration), and food chain characteristics of Arctic ecozones. For example, productivity in terrestrial, freshwater, and marine environments is reduced due to limited nutrient availability, low light, low temperatures, ice cover, and short growing seasons. Compared to most other ecosystems, the Arctic is characterized by relatively low reproduction, organisms that are slower to reach sexual maturity and are generally longer lived, lower species diversity, and distinctive sub-ice biological communities. Relatively short food chains, which are characteristically known for their dominance of marine mammals and birds, are associated with simple predator-prey relationships (e.g. phytoplankton-zooplankton-fish-seal-polar bear or phytoplankton-zooplankton-whale). The combination of all these physical factors affect the sparse distribution and number of Arctic biological communities and makes them very sensitive to physical disturbances such as habitat destruction (AMAP 1998, CACAR 2003).

The assessment and remedial protocols developed are cognizant of striking a balance between the physical disturbances of existing impacted areas versus the physical disturbances of developing new areas required to support remediation activities.



4 ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL

The elements of the assessment protocol have been developed through the review of previous work at related sites (eg. PWGSC 2001a-c, 2002a-f, IEG 2001, EWG 1998, 1999, UMA 1994) and take into consideration information of particular relevance to the unique character of the INAC sites. Typical environmental issues at abandoned military sites include:

- Contaminated soils;
- Existing solid waste disposal areas;
- Debris on surface and in waters near the sites;
- Debris associated with the demolition of structures/facilities; and
- Hazardous waste.

The objective of the environmental assessment of these sites is to collect sufficient information to allow development of a Remedial Action Plan (RAP).

Issues related to implementation, including but not limited to: environmental screening, permitting, and construction, also require information to be collected at the assessment stage. These information requirements can include:

- Geotechnical site information relating to potential development areas for landfills and/or hydrocarbon contaminated soil treatment area, and available borrow sources;
- Site access, such as condition of roadways, the airstrip, barge landing areas, requirements for winter roads or CAT train routes;
- Potable water supply and seasonal fluctuations of potable water supply;
- Siting of camp facilities and temporary storage areas;
- Natural Environment Assessment;
- Traditional Knowledge Surveys/Assessment; and
- Archaeological Assessment.

This section of the protocol provides guidance related to conducting an environmental site assessment that meets the requirements of the INAC cleanup objectives.



4.1 Background Geo-Chemical Assessment

Application of remedial criteria must take into account background concentrations of inorganic elements, as naturally elevated concentrations of a select number of inorganic elements may impact assessment and subsequent remedial activities. High natural variability in concentrations of inorganic elements on a local scale has been observed at several DND DEW Line sites (PIN-1, DYE-M, FOX-2, FOX-3). Based on a desk-top study of the geochemistry and surficial and bedrock geology, a detailed investigation of background concentrations is required in conjunction with the environmental site assessment of the following sites:

- Ross Point (PIN-D)
- Nadluarjuk Lake (FOX-B),
- Kivitoo (FOX-D),
- Durban Island (FOX-E) and
- Padloping Island.

A statistically valid approach must be used to design a sampling program for the collection of representative samples from background areas. Guidance for the background geochemistry investigation is provided in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008).

4.2 Contaminated Soils

4.2.1 Inorganic Elements and PCBs – DCC Criteria

The contaminants of concern for INAC abandoned military sites, where historic land use is limited to former DEW Line operations, is based on a detailed review of data collected to date from DND and INAC site assessment and delineation programs. The DEW Line Cleanup (DLCU) Protocol, which includes criteria for a specific, limited set of contaminants, is considered appropriate for INAC sites. Supporting documentation for selection of these criteria is provided in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008).

This provides a consistent approach across all sites, and is generally considered protective of the Arctic ecosystem as described in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008). Table 4.1 identifies the parameters and criteria.



Table 4.1 DEW Line Cleanup Criteria (DCC) for Soil^a

Parameter in Soil	CRITERIA ^b mg/kg	
	DCC Tier I ^c	DCC Tier II ^d
<i>Inorganic Elements</i>		
Arsenic (As)		30
Cadmium		5.0
Chromium		250
Cobalt		50
Copper		100
Lead	200	500
Mercury		2.0
Nickel		100
Zinc		500
<i>Polychlorinated biphenyls</i>		
PCBs	1.0	5.0

a. These criteria were adopted specifically for the cleanup of Arctic DEW Line Sites from the 1991 versions of the Quebec Soil Contamination Indicators and the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment Interim Canadian Environmental Criteria for Contaminated Sites. They were validated by an assessment of the soil concentration at which the substance was taken up by vascular plants and thereby constituted an input to the Arctic ecosystem.

b. Soil criteria are given in parts per million, ppm.

c. Soils containing lead and/or PCBs at concentrations in excess of DCC Tier I, but less than DCC Tier II, may be landfilled in a Non-Hazardous Waste Landfill,

d. Soils containing one or more substrates in excess of DCC Tier II are to be treated/disposed of in a manner that precludes contact with the Arctic ecosystem.

A review of data collected on INAC sites with land use other than DEW Line activities indicated that the likelihood of other parameters occurring systematically at concentrations exceeding applicable criteria in the absence of other contaminants of concern is low (AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008)).



Based on historic patterns of waste disposal and contamination observed at other abandoned military sites, soils contaminated in excess of the DCC criteria are typically found in the following locations:

- In the vicinity of buildings;
- Former sewage discharge areas;
- Former open storage areas;
- Where surface debris is present;
- Solid waste disposal areas; and
- Petroleum, Oil, Lubricant (POL) bulk storage areas and along fuel lines and transfer locations.

Delineation of the lateral extent and depth of contamination is required to determine quantities of sufficient accuracy to develop a RAP and the subsequent Contractual Drawings and Specifications. A detailed sampling plan shall be developed for each potential area of concern identified as part of historic review, and shall include the following information:

- Description of the objective for each potential area of concern;
- Sampling locations;
- Sampling methodology;
- Proposed number of samples and media;
- Parameters for analyses; and
- Analytical requirements and Quality Assurance/Quality Control measures.

Delineation shall be achieved by sampling in a grid pattern over the affected area. The estimated size of the area determines the grid spacing: the larger the estimated area, the larger the grid spacing. Test pits shall be excavated to determine the depth of contamination. Test pits shall also be excavated outside the area of surface contamination to evaluate whether sub-surface migration of contaminants has occurred. Greater sample density may be warranted based on site specific conditions, particularly in areas where soils contaminated with PCB concentrations in excess of 50 ppm are suspected; such as near buildings where electrical transformers were housed, vehicle maintenance structures, and near exit doors of facilities. It is recommended that over-sampling and an iterative approach to analyses be employed to provide greater confidence that closure is achieved during the assessment phase, recognizing that the cost of analyses is only a fraction of disposal costs.

Additional samples shall be collected and analysed to determine transport and disposal requirements should off-site disposal of contaminated soils be required.



4.2.2 Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soils

Where free product is encountered, the free phase liquid will be addressed prior to the application of a qualitative risk assessment method for establishing remediation requirements.

A review of the assumptions used for the derivation of the CCME CWS for Petroleum Hydrocarbons (PHC) as well as the need to minimize physical disturbance suggests that direct application of criteria for the protection of all receptors may not be appropriate at the INAC sites AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008). A revised set of criteria are provided in Table 4.1. These criteria incorporate the CWS PHC as appropriate, as well as previous quantitative risk assessment results. Two classes of hydrocarbons were identified, Type A – non-mobile, and Type B – mobile. Type A refers to heavy end products, such as lubricating oils, and are easily differentiated by dark staining. Relative to the CWS PHC, Type A consists of the sum of F3 and F4 constituents. Type B includes lighter end or more volatile hydrocarbon products such as MoGas, jet fuel and diesel, and is approximately equal to the sum of the F1 through F3 fractions. When all four fractions are present, the dominant hydrocarbon type is defined by the percentage of the sum of F3 and F4, relative to the sum of F1 to F4 (total TPH). For Type A contaminated soil, the sum of F3 plus F4 must be greater than 70% of the total TPH concentration **and** the F2 concentration must be less than the F4 concentration.

Table 4.1 Remedial Objectives – Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil – INAC Abandoned Military Sites

Exposure Pathway	F1	F2	F3	F4	Type B Hydrocarbon Contamination	Type A Hydrocarbon Concentration
Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life ^(a)	1290 ^(a)	330 ^(a)	NA	NA	330 ^(a)	NA
Direct Soil Eco-Contact	Not utilized – See AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008)					
Protection of Terrestrial Wildlife					2500 ^(b)	
Human Health		11000	20000			20,000
Management Limit					5000 ^(c)	

Notes:

^(a) Within 30 m of a water body

^(b) For surface soils to 0.5 metres depth.

^(c) Below 0.5 m depth, a value of 5000 mg/kg may be applied based on professional judgement.



Based on historic patterns of contamination observed at other abandoned military sites, soils contaminated with hydrocarbons are typically found in the following locations:

- In the vicinity of buildings near fuel distribution lines, fuel dispensing tanks;
- Former open storage areas and/or debris areas where barrels may be present;
- Petroleum, Oil, Lubricant (POL) bulk storage areas; and
- Solid waste disposal areas.

Delineation of the lateral extent and depth of contamination is required to determine quantities of sufficient accuracy to develop a RAP and the subsequent Contractual Drawings and Specifications. A detailed sampling plan shall be developed for each potential area of concern identified as part of historic review, and must include the following information:

- Description of the objective for each potential area of concern;
- Sampling locations;
- Proposed sampling methods for shallow and depth samples, where the depth sampling should achieve a depth consistent with the estimated active layer thickness;
- Proposed number of samples and media;
- Parameters for analyses in accordance with Table 4.2;
- Sampling methodology, analytical requirements, Quality Assurance/Quality Control measures.

At minimum, the information requirements as outlined in Table 4.2 shall be incorporated into the Sampling Plan.



Table 4.2 Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil Information Requirements

Item	Comments
Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soils – Stained Soils (F3/F4 fraction) – Type A	
Areal Extent -Visible surface staining	<p>Topographic survey and location/coordinates of stained areas and sample locations</p> <p>Provide sketches with measurements</p>
Topography	Examine for evidence of erosion (drainage channels)
Soil Description	<p>Include description of grain size distribution, well graded or poorly graded.</p> <p>Fine grained, coarse grained, maximum particle size</p>
Sampling	Collect soil samples for analyses of F1 to F4 fractions to characterize contamination, analyses for presence of co-contaminants such as PCBs.
Confirm Depth of Staining	Testpit to extent of stain, collect soil sample for PHC analyses at 0.5 m depth.
In areas of multiple staining	<p>Identify and survey extent of stains</p> <p>Collect individual samples from most visibly stained areas to represent “worst” case.</p> <p>Focus on stained areas larger than 4 m²</p>
Evidence of residual or free product	
Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soils – Near Fuel Storage, Distribution or Dispensing Areas (F1-F3 fraction) Type B	
Within 30 m of water body supporting aquatic life	
Describe surrounding environment	Consulting locals and elders who use the area may prove to be useful.
Sampling – Hydrocarbons	<p>Delineate laterally and at depth to 330 mg/kg as per on-site analytical capabilities</p> <p>Collect sufficient samples for laboratory analyses of hydrocarbon fractions to confirm correlation with on-site analytical results. Over-sampling and iterative analyses may be required where there is poor correlation with test-kits (organic materials)</p>
Sample groundwater in testpit excavation in source zone.	<p>Collect groundwater samples and analyze for dissolved hydrocarbons (F1, F2) and wastewater discharge criteria (Section 6).</p> <p>Measure water levels, and presence of free product, if applicable</p>



Item	Comments
Greater than 30 m distant of water body supporting aquatic life	
Sampling – Hydrocarbons	<p>Delineate laterally and at depth to 2500 mg/kg as per on-site analytical capabilities.</p> <p>Collect sufficient samples for laboratory analyses of hydrocarbon fractions to confirm correlation with on-site analytical results</p> <p>For the purposes of comparison, use the summation of F1 to F3 concentrations.</p>
Collect soil samples for grain size distribution	Representative samples should be taken of soils within and downgradient of the source zone for determination of grain size distribution, and water content.
All Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil Areas	
Topography	<p>Survey sample locations and topography of source zone and surrounding area. Include min. 25 m buffer zone around contaminated areas.</p> <p>Document seepage zones (toe of embankments), if applicable.</p> <p>Evidence of erosion</p>
Evidence of impacted vegetation	Note presence and extent of vegetation; identify areas of stressed vegetation if applicable.
Wildlife	Note presence or evidence of wildlife (nests, burrows, etc.) within impacted and surrounding area. Review in context with overall Natural Environment Survey (Section 4.9)

Additional representative samples shall be collected and analysed to assist in the determination of treatment requirements. Samples should be collected from areas representing the largest contributions to the PHC contaminated soil volumes (such as bulk fuel storage areas). These analyses include, but are not limited to:

- Water content
- Total Available Nutrients; Total Organic Carbon
- Treatability tests to assess bioremediation potential (bacterial counts, hydrocarbon degraders).



4.3 Solid Waste Disposal Areas

Solid Waste Disposal Areas (WDA) on INAC abandoned military sites are generally smaller in extent than those located on DND DEW Line sites, and may be more appropriately referred to as buried debris areas or dump sites. As part of the historic review, areas of ground disturbance/landfill activity will be identified for further investigation. A detailed investigation/sampling plan shall be developed for each area, and must include the following information:

- Description of the objective for each potential area of concern
- Methodology for determining extent of buried debris using non-intrusive geophysical surveys, such as Electro-Magnetic Surveys (EM) or Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR), and associated ground-truthing. The consultant is to indicate the type of geophysical survey to be used based on anticipated ground conditions. In general, a grid-survey pattern shall be used that provides adequate coverage of the area. Identification of areas of surface debris within the geophysical survey area is required to allow correlation with geophysical survey results. All geophysical surveys must be referenced to a UTM coordinate system.
- Identification of sampling locations both up- and down-gradient of the landfill, debris area or dump site.
- Proposed sampling methods for shallow and depth samples, where depth sampling should achieve a depth consistent with the estimated active layer thickness.
- Proposed number of samples and media.
- Parameters for analyses.
- Sampling methodology, analytical requirements, and Quality Assurance/Quality Control measures.

In addition, general site information shall be collected as outlined in Section 4.9 and 4.10, as well as specific information for each WDA as described below to support the evaluation of the potential environmental risk associated with the WDA (Annex A).

Physical Characteristics:

Areal Extent of WDA Extent

Depth of Buried Debris, as applicable

Contaminant Characterization (concentrations/extent)

Volume and extent of exposed debris, where exposed debris is defined as surface and/or partially buried debris within 0.5 meters of the surface.



Pathway/Transport Mechanisms

Surface expressions of contaminated soil and/or leachate.

Grades/Topography

Surface cover materials type and depth

Evidence of erosion

Precipitation

Distance to downgradient perennial surface water bodies

Receptor Characteristics

Distance to freshwater/marine habitat and habitat usage.

Terrestrial Habitat

Traditional Land Use

Minor modifications to the evaluation matrix prepared by the DND/NTI Environmental Working Group (EWG 1998) will be used for the assessment of potential environmental risk (Annex A). These modifications included:

- Addressing remedial requirements for dump sites and debris areas (generally smaller in size than landfills)
- Modifying contaminant characterization to include leachate migration and the presence of contaminants as one category.
- Including consideration of snow pack as well as annual precipitation.

Additional detail regarding the evaluation of WDAs is provided in Annex A.

4.4 Surface Debris

Surface debris is present on many of the sites, and may consist of a variety of waste materials including:

- Scrap metal and wood wastes (painted/unpainted);
- Barrels, potentially containing product; and
- Asbestos, batteries, and electrical equipment.



All areas of debris shall be inventoried to the extent possible to provide volume estimates and characterization of waste materials. Site debris shall be classified as inert, non-hazardous wastes or hazardous wastes in accordance with the following Acts and Regulations.

- Federal Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and Regulations
- The Canadian Environmental Protection Act
- The Nunavut or Northwest Territories Environmental Protection Act

The number of barrels containing product shall be inventoried where it is safe to do so. However, it is impractical to sample and analyse contents of all barrels on site during the assessment phase. To provide information required for the Remedial Action Plan, a statistically relevant number of barrels shall be sampled and analysed for parameters in accordance with the barrel protocol, and as summarized below:

Organic Phase: Total Chlorine, PCBs, Cadmium, Chromium, Lead

Aqueous Phase: % Alcohols and Glycols, Total Chlorine, Cadmium, Chromium, Lead

If the aqueous phase is less than 2% alcohols or glycols, water shall be analysed in accordance with waste water discharge criteria. Annex B provides further information on the Barrel Protocol.

4.5 Submerged Debris

Debris may be present in the near shore marine environment and/or lakes that are present on the site. Observations of debris in water shall be recorded to the extent possible and supplemented with local and anecdotal knowledge. Previous studies have confirmed that such debris is primarily a risk to navigation in shallow waters (AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008)).

4.6 Buildings/Structure Inventory

Existing buildings and infrastructure at a site will be demolished down to their foundations as part of the cleanup. To assist in the development of the RAP, an inventory of building contents, foundation construction materials and details, and building/structure construction materials and dimensions are required. Building contents, where present, shall be inventoried and classified as non-hazardous or hazardous wastes. Hazardous building materials may include, but not be limited to: PCB and lead-amended paint, asbestos containing materials (ACMs), fluorescent lights, and mercury containing switches.



Painted building materials shall be tested for total lead and PCBs, and leachable lead and PCBs in order to determine disposal requirements. Samples of concrete, excluding paint, shall be collected and analysed for PCBs. The locations and number of samples are to be determined in the field. Samples should be collected from both stained and non-stained areas on concrete on surface and at depth. Over-sampling and iterative analyses is recommended. As part of the assessment, a detailed waste inventory shall be prepared that includes: dimensions, building materials, foundation materials (concrete slab, timber piles, timber crib), estimated volume and mass of wastes, and the basis of any assumptions used in the estimate. Painted materials must be specifically identified and the extent of paint coverage and adherence quantified.

4.7 Geotechnical Requirements

4.7.1 Potential Development Areas

New engineered landfills and hydrocarbon treatment areas may be required during cleanup. Potential locations shall be identified and surveyed during the site assessment phase. Guidelines for the siting of potential development areas include:

- Avoidance of permafrost sensitive areas, vegetated areas and archaeological features.
- Avoidance of contaminated areas.
- Maintain a distance of 300 m or more from downgradient permanent water features.
- Locate at elevations greater than 2 metres above sea level or storm surge level
- Ground surface topography with grades of 6% or less.
- Proximity to borrow sources, waste materials.

The INAC sites are all located within the zone of continuous permafrost. The sensitivity of permafrost to climate warming consists of two components, the thermal response to warming and the impact of thaw (physical response) (Smith, Burgess, 2004) as cited in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008). The physical response of the terrain to permafrost degradation is mainly dependent on the ice content of the frozen material (Dyke et al., 1997). Warming of ice-rich perennially frozen ground would eventually lead to its thawing and the resultant thaw settlement, slope instability, thaw slumping, thermokarst, and other permafrost degradation-related processes. Excess ground ice can be identified by landforms at surface, such as patterned ground. An evaluation of the potential for impacts due to climate change is provided in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008).



Potential development areas shall be surveyed to provide detailed topographic information to allow generation of ground contours. A buffer zone of a minimum of 50 m should be surveyed around all proposed development areas. In previously disturbed areas, soil sampling and analyses shall be carried out to confirm or disprove the presence of any historic contamination using a targeted approach. Additional sampling should be carried out over a grid with spacing of approximately 50 m x 50 m.

4.7.2 Borrow Sources

During cleanup, borrow material is required for construction of new landfills, development of treatment areas, backfilling of contaminated soil excavation, closure of existing landfills, general regrading and for road construction/maintenance.

Available existing sources of borrow material should be exhausted before exploiting new areas. Areas of excess ground ice or of biophysical significance (denning/nesting areas) are to be avoided. Use of abandoned gravel pads and road infrastructure as granular source material is preferable, wherever possible. Existing gravel pads shall be screened for the presence of contaminants during the assessment phase.

Borrow sources shall be identified and characterized and estimated quantities developed. Test-pits shall be excavated to confirm subsurface stratigraphy, seepage, depth to permafrost table or bedrock, and ground ice conditions. Select soil samples shall be retained for geotechnical laboratory testing to assist in the development of Specifications. Testing shall include, but not be limited to: water content, grain size distribution, and moisture density relationships. At sites where background inorganic element concentrations are elevated, additional samples shall be collected for geo-chemical characterization of the borrow material.

4.7.3 Site Access

Access to the sites is typically by barge/ship and aircraft and on site by existing access roads. A limited number of sites are land-locked. Use of the airstrip is essential to mobilize materials and equipment required for site activities. An inspection and sampling of the airstrip fill materials shall be completed during the assessment phase to determine the load capacity to support a variety of aircraft. Drainage and erosion features shall be documented in order to assess the useable length, and/or upgrading requirements.

Investigation of potential CAT Train and/or other equipment mobilization options shall be investigated for the mobilization of heavy equipment. Construction records for Short Range Radar (SRR) sites located in the vicinity may be available as reference. Suitability of the beach for barge landing/sea lift access shall also be assessed. Local knowledge and Traditional Knowledge (TK) may prove useful in evaluating potential CAT train routes as well as suitable barge landing sites.

Helicopter landing pads, associated with Short Range Radar sites, are within the DND reserve. Only a non-intrusive visual inspection should be carried out to document the physical status of these areas.



4.7.4 Siting of Camp Facilities and Temporary Storage areas.

Laydown areas are required for temporary camp structures, equipment and storage during the cleanup. Potential locations shall be identified during the site assessment phase. Where possible, these will be located in previously disturbed areas such as borrow or storage areas, to minimize any new disturbances.

4.8 Potable Water Supply

A suitable drinking water supply shall be identified during the site assessment phase. A qualitative assessment of the flow rates (as applicable) shall be made at the time of the site assessment, as flow will vary throughout the season, with higher flows typically in spring run-off. Identifying the high water mark, and estimating depth of the stream/lake, as applicable, will aid in this evaluation. The Contractor will be advised that water withdrawal rates may not exceed 10% of the flow volume or 10% of the water volume in a lake, and to modify consumption as appropriate. Water samples shall be collected and analysed for criteria in accordance with the latest edition of the CCME Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality.

4.9 Natural Environment Assessment

A thorough assessment of the natural environment of the site and surrounding area shall be conducted as part of the detailed environmental site assessment. This assessment shall be carried out mainly by a biologist with input from a local community representative, where appropriate. This study shall consist of describing the regional and local setting, local ecosystems, species assemblage as well as potential impacts to vegetation and wildlife from cleanup activities and proposed mitigation measures. Additional information requirements are outlined in the following subsections.

4.9.1 Regional and Local Setting

The report should address the following information requirements.

- Location (site coordinates, main natural and man-made features present);
- Ecosetting (ecozones and ecoregions);
- Climate (mean temperature and precipitation data);
- Vegetation;
- Landforms and soils (main land features, soil types, general topography); and
- Human usage and disturbance (TK input will be valuable to assess human usage of the area).



4.9.2 Local Ecosystems

This subsection should describe 1) the various inland ecosystems; 2) the ecosystems present in the former operational areas (*i.e.*, disturbed areas and areas with infrastructure); as well as, if applicable, 3) the shore/coastline ecosystem; and the 4) open ocean ecosystem.

Each identified ecosystem should be described in terms of the various terrestrial and freshwater habitats, the vegetation and wildlife species present in those habitats, as well as past and current impacts and disturbances to habitats. Local and traditional knowledge from people who use these areas for hunting and fishing may provide useful information on plant and wildlife species present as well as ecosystem health.

4.9.3 Species Assemblage

This subsection should describe the various species at risk (*i.e.*, extirpated, endangered, threatened, or special concern) according to the Species at Risk Act (SARA) that occur in the general vicinity of the site, as well as any migratory species that known to breed or nest in the area (Migratory Birds Convention Act).

All species (*i.e.*, birds, mammals, fish, and plants) observed or known to use the site and surrounding areas should be documented. Observations should be described in terms of numbers and behaviour during sighting (*e.g.*, migrating, nesting/breeding, feeding, etc.). Species not observed on site but known to use the area may be documented by consulting local community representatives as well as various studies and reports.

4.9.4 Impacts and Mitigation

Potential impacts to vegetation and wildlife from site investigation and remediation activities should be clearly identified. Proposed constraints and other recommendations should also be presented as part of the Natural Environment Assessment, in order to incorporate these requirements into the Environmental Protection Plan.

4.10 Traditional Knowledge Surveys/Assessment

Traditional Knowledge (TK) forms an integral part of the development of the RAP. Incorporating TK during the assessment phase can provide guidance on targeting specific areas of concern to local residents. Qualitative knowledge provided by local residents can be used to complement and enhance the largely quantitative information provided by the physical studies completed.



TK can be efficiently obtained through a local community representative (*i.e.*, local TK consultant) who can liaise between the Consultant and various TK holders in the community. The local TK consultant may either be an Elder or someone else who knows the site well (*e.g.*, hunter, ranger). The ideal local TK consultant possesses some TK, but more importantly knows who to consult in the community to obtain relevant site information and TK.

4.10.1 Typical TK and Local Knowledge

TK may be grouped into four main categories:

1. Historical and Archaeological Features
2. Wildlife Use
3. Land Use
4. Site Specific Information

Historical and archaeological features provide information on traditional land use of the area. These features, often hidden from the untrained eye, will be identified by local TK holders as to their use and relative age, and can complement the work of the archaeological assessment.

Wildlife use of the land in and around the site includes migration routes, mating and calving grounds, as well as summer and winter-feeding areas of large land mammals. Nesting, moulting, and summer feeding grounds of migratory birds such as geese and ducks, as well as migration routes and feeding areas of sea mammals must also be identified.

Land use relates to traditional usage of the land and sea for hunting, fishing, camping, and harvesting products on land (*e.g.*, berries, eggs, medicine, tea, drinking water), and harvesting of sea products (*e.g.*, clams, kelp).

Site-specific information about the military site while it was under construction or in operation, including events (spills, accidents), waste management practices (storage, dumping), as well as natural occurrences, should also be documented.



4.11 Archaeological Assessment

The overall purpose of the archaeological assessment is to obtain the necessary archaeological regulatory approval at the assessment stage as required to implement the remediation program. The scope of the archaeological assessment shall include:

- Preparation and submission of permit applications to the Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (Nunavut) or the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (NWT).
- Completion of an Overview for each site, which would include file searches to determine the number, nature and terrain associations of previously recorded sites.
- Completion of a field inventory and assessment of each site;
- Completion of a heritage features or structures evaluation for consideration of heritage value;
- Provision of a heritage resource impact assessment for each site
- Implementation of more detailed investigations at key sites and appropriate mitigation at significant sites affected by proposed projects (if required); and
- Preparation of a final permit report for each site and, if required, provides a summary of these results suitable for inclusion in a screening document.

Areas of high and moderate archaeological potential for containing cultural material will require detailed examination during the assessment phase, to ensure the protection and if required, development of mitigation measures to be implemented prior to or during cleanup.



5 REMEDIATION PROTOCOL

The elements of the remediation protocol have been developed through the review of previous work at related sites by DND and INAC, and take into consideration information of particular relevance to the unique character of the INAC sites.

The primary components of cleanup on the INAC abandoned military sites include:

- Treatment/Disposal of Contaminated Soil
- Disposal of Debris/Demolition Waste
- Closure of Existing Solid Waste Disposal Areas
- Construction of New Landfills
- Development of Borrow Sources and Site Grading Activities

The goals of a RAP are to provide the foundation for development of a cleanup design that will reduce the environmental liabilities present at the site, maximize benefits to local communities and provide good value to the Crown. More specifically, the RAP is to identify and evaluate options applicable to the treatment and/or disposal of waste materials present at a site. These waste materials typically include:

- Soil contaminated with inorganic elements, PCBs and/or petroleum hydrocarbons;
- Non-hazardous and hazardous wastes associated with building/facility demolition;
- Visible/accessible debris including barrel contents; and
- Buried debris/landfills as identified by geophysical surveys

The estimated volume of waste materials in each stream shall be determined and options evaluated on the basis of effectiveness to reduce and/or mitigate environmental risks in the short and long term, long term liability or residual risks, relative costs, monitoring costs and community acceptance. The costs associated with implementing remedial solutions include, but are not limited to: resources, such as materials, equipment, and personnel, and site logistics. Mobilization and site access constitute a significant cost for remote site cleanups, and can have significant impact on selection of the preferred remedial option. The evaluations shall be summarized and preferred remedial options identified for each waste stream. Options shall be integrated to finalize the recommended approach for site remediation.

During remediation planning public community consultations are conducted in surrounding communities to obtain feedback on the draft RAP.



5.1 Contaminated Soils

Contaminated soils are considered in three primary categories: soils that are regulated; soils classified as hazardous; and, soils classified as contaminated but not hazardous waste. Contaminated soils that are regulated shall be remediated and/or disposed of in compliance with the applicable regulations. Hazardous contaminated soils are defined as those that exceed criteria as provided in the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and Regulations. Contaminated soils that are not regulated or hazardous shall be excavated to the depth and extent to meet the DCC (see section 4.2.1) or PHC remedial targets (Section 4.2.2).

Three primary contaminated soil types have been identified; inorganic element contaminated soil, PCB contaminated soil and hydrocarbon contaminated soil. Where multiple contaminants are present in the soils, the most conservative remedial option that addresses all contaminant types shall be applied. A summary of remedial options for contaminated soils is presented in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Summary of Remedial Options – Contaminated Soil

Contaminated Soil	Remedial Options
DCC Tier I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excavate and place in an on-site engineered landfill or ▪ Cap in place under 0.3 m of clean fill if in a stable location
DCC Tier II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavate and dispose of in an on-site Tier II facility or • Containerize for off-site disposal¹
Inorganic Elements Leaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport in accordance with the TDGA for disposal at an off-site facility
PCB Contaminated Soil in excess of CEPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Store in accordance with Storage of PCB Material Regulations pending a decision regarding disposal
Type A TPH (Non-Mobile Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavate and place in an on-site engineered landfill or • Scarify surficial stains that meet PHC criteria.
DCC Tier I -Type A TPH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavate and place in an on-site engineered landfill or • Cap in place under 0.3 m of clean fill if in a stable location
DCC Tier II -Type A TPH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavate and place in an on-site Tier II disposal facility or • Containerize for off-site disposal¹
Type B TPH (Mobile Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In-situ</i> or <i>ex-situ</i> treatment to reduce environmental risk to meet guidelines
DCC Tier I -Type B TPH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ex-situ treatment to meet guidelines and place in an on-site engineered landfill or cap under 0.3 m of clean fill in a stable location after treatment. • Small areas of contamination may be excavated and disposed of in a Tier II disposal facility
DCC Tier II -Type B TPH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavate and place in an on-site Tier II Facility or • Containerize for off-site disposal¹
Hazardous Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispose in compliance with applicable regulations

¹ Decision of whether to dispose of on or off-site is based on cost –benefit analyses (see Section 5.4.2).



5.2 Debris – Site Debris and Demolition Wastes

Site debris shall be collected and segregated into hazardous and non-hazardous waste streams for disposal:

Non hazardous waste: The volume of the non-hazardous materials shall be minimized through crushing, shredding, or incineration, prior to placement in an on-site engineered landfill. If there is no existing landfill on-site, and no suitable location for a new engineered landfill, non-hazardous materials shall be disposed of off-site; and

Hazardous waste: These materials shall be disposed of off-site, in accordance with the current regulations governing the handling and disposal of hazardous materials.

Hazardous materials referred to in this section are defined as any materials, which are, designated "hazardous" or "dangerous goods" under Territorial or Federal legislation. Generally, all hazardous materials identified at the site shall be collected and transported off site, in accordance with the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act (TC 2002), to a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility.

Hazardous materials that are typical of abandoned military sites and require special consideration include the following:

PCB Contaminated Concrete: Concrete (excluding paint) with PCB concentrations in excess of 50 ppm is regulated under the CEPA, and shall be collected and transported off-site, in accordance with the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and CEPA to a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility.

PCB Paint on Building Components: PCB paint and PCB painted components that are regulated under the CEPA, shall be collected and transported off site, in accordance with the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and CEPA, to a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility. PCB painted materials are considered regulated under CEPA when the component, (paint and substrate) contain greater than 50 ppm PCBs total. Accordingly, knowledge of the thickness and density of the paint, and substrate material is required to calculate total PCB concentrations. Loose paint materials/paint chips are regulated under CEPA when PCB concentrations in the paint are greater than 50 ppm.



Lead-Based Paint on Building Components: Lead-based painted components that are classified as hazardous material shall be collected and transported off site, in accordance with the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act to a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility. Painted components that exceed the relevant federal or Territorial criteria but are not considered hazardous shall be collected and disposed in an on-site engineered landfill. Lead-based painted materials are considered hazardous when the lead leachate concentrations from a test of the component (paint and substrate) exceed 5 mg/L or the concentration as provided in the latest schedule of the TDGA. Additional discussion related to the classification of painted material is provided in AMSRP Volume 2, (INAC 2008).

There are also a few exceptions, which are described below:

Asbestos: Asbestos waste shall be collected, double bagged and disposed of in an on-site engineered landfill, in accordance with the appropriate legislation. Where no on-site facility is available, asbestos waste shall be shipped off-site for disposal. Where asbestos materials are painted, disposal requirements are based on paint analyses.

Petroleum Products: Petroleum products, such as gasoline or diesel, which do not contain other hazardous products (chlorine, PCB, metals, etc.) will be incinerated on-site under appropriate emissions controls. Heavier petroleum products such as lubricating oil will be disposed of off-site or mixed with lighter petroleum products and incinerated on-site under appropriate emissions controls in accordance with the Barrel Protocol provided in Annex B.

Compressed Gas Cylinders: Compressed gas cylinders with known contents shall be vented. Once empty, the metal cylinder shall be disposed on-site in an engineered landfill. Where no on-site facility is available, compressed gas cylinders shall be shipped off-site for disposal.

Creosote Treated Timbers: Timbers shall be wrapped in polyethylene sheets and disposed on-site in an engineered landfill. Where no on-site facility is available, creosote treated timbers shall be shipped off-site for disposal.

5.2.1 Submerged Debris

Submerged debris shall be removed from the near-shore environment to a depth of 2 metres or 30 metres off-shore, whichever is encountered first. Work in marine and freshwater environments shall be in accordance with all stipulations as provided by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Debris, once removed, shall be classified as hazardous or non-hazardous and disposed of as indicated in the previous sub-section.



5.2.2 Barrels

Barrels shall be handled according to the Barrel Protocol (Annex B) and as outlined below:

Empty Barrels: Empty barrels shall be crushed and disposed in an on-site engineered landfill;

Filled or Partially Filled Barrels: Barrel contents shall be inspected and tested if necessary and disposed of appropriately (off-site or incinerated). The empty barrel shall be rinsed, crushed and disposed on-site in an engineered landfill. The spent rinse liquid shall be tested and disposed of appropriately. Absorbent materials used as part of this process shall be incinerated if incineration criteria are met, or disposed of as hazardous material, as required; and

Buried Empty Barrels: Areas containing buried empty barrels will be inspected to determine if any of the barrels contain material and characterized through a geophysical survey. If the barrels are found to be empty, the area will be stabilized through compaction to crush any corroded barrels, if the area is deemed suitable from a geotechnical perspective. A cover of borrow material shall be placed over the area and compacted.

The criteria used to determine the acceptability of product for on-site incineration are summarized in Table 5.2 as follows:

Table 5.2 Barrel Protocol Criteria and Disposal Summary

Phase	% Alcohol or Glycols	PCBs	Chlorine ppm	Cadmium ppm	Chromium ppm	Lead ppm	Disposal
Organic		<2	<1000	<2	<10	<100	On-Site Incineration
Organic		>2	>1000	>2	>10	>100	Ship South
Aqueous	>2		>1000	>2	>10	>100	Ship South
Aqueous	>2		<1000	<2	<10	<100	On-Site Incineration
Aqueous	<2						Discard in accordance with wastewater discharge criteria

Wastewater generated during barrel cleaning shall be treated to meet discharge criteria in accordance with permits and licences issued for cleanup activities.



5.2.3 Buildings and Infrastructure

Existing buildings and infrastructure shall be demolished to concrete foundations. Above-grade timber foundations shall be removed. Where concrete foundations are above grade, the area will be re-graded with the placement of additional granular fill to match surrounding topography. Exposed timber piles shall be removed to a minimum of 0.3 m below ground surface. All hazardous materials shall be segregated prior to or during demolition. Non-hazardous demolition materials and asbestos shall be collected and disposed in an on-site engineered landfill. If there is no existing landfill on site and no suitable location for a new engineered landfill, the non-hazardous materials shall be disposed of off-site. Hazardous demolition materials shall be disposed off-site.

PCB amended painted material shall be containerized in accordance with the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, and transported off-site to a licensed treatment disposal facility.

Only in exceptional circumstances will existing buildings remain intact on site following the remediation program. These structures may remain as emergency shelters only once clear transfer of ownership has been established.

5.3 Solid Waste Disposal Area (WDA) Closure

The following section applies to landfills, dumps and debris areas, collectively referred to as WDA. Using the WDA evaluation matrix (Annex A), WDA can be classified into one of three broad categories. Actions associated with each category of WDA have been identified. Where a WDA exists on INAC abandoned military sites, the condition of the WDA shall be evaluated to determine the most appropriate action;

Class A: If the WDA is located in an unstable, high erosion location, it shall be relocated to a properly engineered landfill. A WDA located at an elevation of less than two metres above mean sea level will be removed. During the relocation process, any identified hazardous materials shall be segregated for off-site disposal.

Class B: If the WDA is located in a suitable, stable location, but there is evidence of contaminant migration, potential remedial solutions include excavation or provision of a suitably engineered containment system. Permafrost containment shall be designed in accordance with the geothermal requirements outlined in Section 5.4.2. The remedial solution selected shall be based on a cost-benefit analyses that includes consideration of construction costs and long-term monitoring costs.

Class C: If the WDA is located in a suitable, stable location, with no evidence of contaminant migration, it may be left in place. If required, additional granular fill shall be placed to ensure erosion protection and proper drainage. Consideration must be given to surrounding topography (to blend into existing terrain) and long term monitoring costs.



Additional information related to landfill design and closure is provided in AMSRP Volume 2, (INAC 2008).

5.4 Landfill Development

New engineered landfills may be required for the disposal of non-regulated contaminated soils and non-hazardous debris collected or generated during cleanup. Two classes of landfills are provided:

- Non-Hazardous Waste (NHW) Landfill
- Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill

5.4.1 Non-Hazardous Waste Landfill

A NHW Landfill is a new landfill constructed for the disposal of non-hazardous debris and building demolition waste. Tier I contaminated soils and Type A PHC soil may also be disposed of in these landfills. Landfills constructed to date at DND DEW sites are predominately above ground facilities. These landfills do not rely on permafrost for containment nor do they include a geosynthetic liner.

The general design parameters include a perimeter berm and landfill cover constructed of a well graded sand and gravel. Clay is generally not available at the abandoned military sites. The sand and gravel should have a minimum of 8% fines (<0.08 mm) and be compacted to a minimum of 95% maximum dry density (ASTM D698). The landfill should have a maximum debris thickness of 3 m and minimum cover thickness of 1.0 m.

To reduce settlement and ground subsidence, debris should be placed in maximum 0.5 m thick lifts with granular fill placed over each lift of debris to fill the voids (intermediate fill). Intermediate fill should be a minimum of 0.15 m thick and worked into the underlying debris. The final landfill surface must be graded such that water ponding does not occur. Ponding and infiltration could increase the seasonal thaw depth or contribute to leachate generation. The landfill surface must not be so steep that it promotes erosion of the cover materials, which could expose debris.

Fill material for the landfill cap should be a well-graded material that is relatively erosion resistant and will have moderate water infiltration. Alternative designs or surface treatments, such as imported coarser gravels and cobbles, vegetation covers at sites where it is possible to vegetate the sites, roller compacted concrete or other synthetic surfaces, are required if erosion resistant materials are not present on site.

Final landfill design parameters including granular fill specifications, side slopes, cover thickness, and maximum height of landfill are dependent on site specific ground conditions and borrow availability. Designs must be reviewed by a geotechnical engineer with permafrost experience.



5.4.2 Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill

The decision as to whether to construct a Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill on site is based on a number of factors, including but not limited to those summarized in Table 5.3. These criteria were based on generic designs and relative cost estimates and may not accurately reflect site-specific conditions. These are provided as a guideline only.

Table 5.3 Decision Criteria Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill

Is the site landlocked?	For landlocked sites, off-site transport costs increase significantly. Consideration should be given to on-site disposal facility.
Is landfill excavation required.	Landfill excavations pose contracting risks due to unknown quantities of waste material. To mitigate risks, an on-site Tier II disposal facility should be considered.
Are known contaminated soil volumes less than 300 to 500 m ³ .	If yes, evaluate contingency factors and potential over-runs. If significant risk of quantity overrun is present, construct landfill on-site. If volume of contaminated soil estimated to be below these values, ship off-site for disposal.
Are known volumes of contaminated soil between 500 and 1000 m ³	Evaluate site specific conditions, and develop preliminary design and cost estimate for an on-site disposal facility using site specific information. Confirm availability and quality of borrow material.
Are known volumes of contaminated soil greater than 1000 m ³ .	If yes, confirm availability and quality of granular borrow. If granular borrow sufficient, develop preliminary design and cost estimate for an on-site disposal facility, using site specific conditions. Re-evaluate on-site disposal costs versus off-site disposal and confirm cost-benefit.

The Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill design is based on the containment of contaminated soil in a landfill provided with a geo-synthetic liner and a granular fill cover of sufficient thickness to maintain the contaminated soil in a frozen condition. The required fill thickness is a function of the climatic conditions selected as the design criteria.

Geothermal analyses are required to substantiate the use of permafrost as a means of containment for the landfills. Analyses are carried out to predict the short-term and long-term ground temperatures for the Tier II Contaminated Soil Landfill to determine:

- Length of time for landfill freezeback;
- Short-term and long-term thermal regime in the landfill; and
- Depth of annual thaw (active layer) in the cover material.



Geothermal analyses should be carried out for the landfills using two-dimensional finite element computer models. The models simulate transient, two-dimensional heat conduction with a change of phase for a variety of boundary conditions. Heat exchange at the ground surface should be modeled with an energy balance equation that considers air temperatures, wind velocity, snow depth, and solar radiation. The models should include the temperature phase change relationships for saline soils, such that freezing depression and unfrozen water content variations can be explicitly modeled.

Soil thermal properties required to carry out geothermal analyses include: porewater composition, latent heat, specific heat (frozen and unfrozen), and thermal conductivity (frozen and unfrozen). These properties are determined indirectly from well-established correlations with soil index properties, moisture content, grain size distribution, bulk density, salinity, etc. (Farouki, 1986; Johnston, 1981). Soil index properties are based on information collected during the site investigations.

Climatic data required for the thermal model include monthly mean air temperature, wind speed, solar radiation, and snow cover. The thermal analysis should be calibrated to measured temperatures and/or observed active layers thicknesses. The landfill designs include analyses for mean temperature conditions, warm conditions and long-term climate change. Statistical analyses are carried out to determine mean monthly temperatures representative of a 1 in 100 warm year. The freezing index and thawing index for each year are calculated from the recorded air temperature data. The index for each year is ranked in ascending order and plotted. A “best-fit” line is drawn through the set of points to estimate the 1 in 100 warm year index. Mean monthly air temperatures are increased by the ratio of the 1 in 100 warm year freezing or thawing index to the mean year freezing or thawing index to estimate the mean monthly temperatures of a 1 in 100 warm year. The influence of climate change should be evaluated by similar methods presented in ACIA (2005). This includes the average estimated seasonal temperature changes by various Global Circulation Models (GCMs).

Given the uncertainties in climate change and the cost of returning to a site at a future date, it is recommended that the Soil Disposal Facility be designed for 100 years of long-term climate warming (average of four GCMs) as a minimum. With this design condition, the active layer could penetrate the contaminated soil if a warm year occurred. Containment during this condition would be provided by the thick soil cover and the geomembrane liner. Additional factors of safety can also be applied to account for uncertainties in the geothermal model, soil input parameters, and climate input parameters, or the facilities can be designed for climate change plus one 1 in 100 warm year.



5.5 Borrow Source Development

Granular borrow material will be required for the development of new landfills and general site grading purposes.

5.5.1 Site Grading

Grading operations generally consist of the shaping and regrading of disturbed areas to blend in with the natural contours, in accordance with all applicable licenses. Disturbed areas may include:

- contaminated soil excavation areas,
- existing and new landfill areas,
- debris areas,
- areas disturbed during demolition activities,
- granular borrow areas, and
- any area disturbed during establishment and operation of the camp, equipment storage and maintenance activities.

5.6 Contractor Support Activities

For implementation of remedial activities, a Contractor will establish a camp and storage areas on-site, where required. Where possible, these will be located in previously disturbed areas such as borrow or storage areas, to minimize any new disturbances in accordance with all applicable licenses.

Domestic refuse generated by the camp shall be incinerated and disposed of on-site in an engineered landfill. Sewage shall be handled by an appropriately sized sewage treatment system, in accordance with applicable legislation and all applicable licenses.

Wastewater generated by the Contractor, shall be treated to meet discharge criteria as stipulated in permits and licenses issued for the project.

Potable water supplies at the site will be tested and used, only if they meet the Canadian Drinking Water Quality Standards (CCME 2002) or the latest edition thereof, in accordance with all applicable licenses.

Fuel required for the operation of the camp will be stored on-site in accordance with applicable legislation and licenses.



All hazardous materials shall be segregated prior to or during demolition. Non-hazardous demolition materials and asbestos shall be collected and disposed in an on-site engineered landfill. Hazardous demolition materials shall be disposed off-site.

Only in exceptional circumstances shall existing buildings remain intact on site following the remediation program. These structures may remain as emergency shelters once clear transfer of ownership has been established.



6 CONSTRUCTION RELATED IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

Consistent with Step 9 of the Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan, confirmation that the objectives of the RAP have been met is required. Based on the issues typically associated with the remediation of INAC sites, confirmatory testing encompasses a wider range of activities. These include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Confirmatory testing of contaminated soils;
- Quality Assurance testing of earthworks associated with the remediation and construction of landfills;
- Testing as required for waste manifesting to allow for shipment and disposal of materials off-site; and
- Testing as required to meet the requirements of Land Use Permits, and/or other Licences/Permits issued for the cleanup program.

The requirements and/or guidelines for these testing programs are outlined in the following sub-sections.

6.1 Confirmatory Testing Contaminated Soils

Following excavation of contaminated material confirmatory samples shall be collected and analyzed to ensure that cleanup objectives have been met. Sampling will be conducted by a third party qualified to carry out such work. A detailed sampling plan shall be developed for each area of concern identified for excavation in the RAP, and must include the following information:

- Description of the objective for each potential area of concern
- Sampling locations
- Sampling methodology
- Proposed number of samples and media
- Parameters for analyses
- Analytical requirements, and Quality Assurance/Quality Control measures.



6.1.1 Tier I contaminated soils

Tier I criteria were developed to address aerial transport of contaminants; excavation and backfilling precludes this pathway. If, during the site assessment, sufficient evidence has been collected to demonstrate that soils at depths of greater than 0.3 m below surface do not exceed Tier II levels for inorganic elements or PCBs, confirmatory sampling will not be required.

6.1.2 Tier II contaminated soils

Confirmatory sampling shall be carried out using a systematic grid sampling design following the DND DLCU Confirmatory Sampling Protocol as summarized in Table 6.1. This design provides a practical and simple method for designating sample locations and ensures uniform coverage of a site. Discrete samples should be collected at every point on the grid. For small areas, all samples shall be analyzed, whereas for larger areas only a fraction of the interior grid samples shall be analyzed. When choosing sample locations for analysis, consideration shall be given to areas of previously high concentrations. No single sample result or the mean of a duplicate/replicate sample shall exceed the cleanup objectives. In cases where field analytical methodology is used, 10-20% of the samples analyzed in the field should also be analyzed in the laboratory for quality control purposes.

Table 6.1 Confirmatory Testing Grid Sizes

Size of area	Grid size	# Perimeter samples analyzed	# Interior grid samples analyzed
<100 m ²	3x3 m	all	all
>100 m ² , <2500 m ²	6x6 m	50%	40%
>2500 m ²	12x12 m	50%	40%

6.1.3 Hazardous Soils

Confirmatory sampling following excavation of soils considered hazardous according to CEPA (PCBs >50 ppm) or the TDGA may require a more closely spaced grid than outlined in Table 6.1 to minimize the overall volume of materials requiring off-site disposal.



6.1.4 Type B TPH (Fractions F1 to F3)

Confirmatory sampling following excavation of petroleum hydrocarbon impacted soils within 30 m of a water body supporting aquatic life will follow the confirmatory sampling protocol outlined in section 6.1.2. The remedial solution for petroleum hydrocarbon impacted soils further removed from surface water bodies involves excavation of source areas. In cases where field analytical methodology is used, 10-20% of the samples analyzed in the field should also be analyzed in the laboratory for quality control purposes. For comparison purposes, total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) data obtained by hexane extraction can be compared to data generated using the CCME analytical procedure for PHC in soils by summing fractions F1 to F3. The presence of residual petroleum hydrocarbon contamination is expected following excavation to design limits as outlined in the RAP. Representative samples from the base of the excavation will be collected and analyzed for record keeping purposes using the CCME analytical procedure for PHC in soils.

6.1.5 Ex-situ Confirmatory Sampling

Soils excavated from landfills and dumps will be classified ex-situ. Excavated soils will be placed in windrows or stockpiles with a maximum stockpile size of 20 m³ (B.C. Environment, 1995). Debris is separated from the soil and sorted as potentially hazardous and non-hazardous under the supervision of the Hazardous Materials Specialist. Stained soil and soil associated with potentially contaminated debris such as battery waste or barrels must be stockpiled separately from other soil to prevent dilution and facilitate disposal.

As part of the sampling protocol, two types of soil samples shall be collected from stockpiles: discrete and composite. Sample locations are selected at various surface and depth locations in each stockpile to obtain samples that are representative of the entire pile. Five discrete samples are collected and analyzed for the first 20 stockpiles and every 20th stockpile thereafter. Composite samples shall be collected and analyzed at all stockpiles. Composite samples consist of approximately equal volumes of soil collected from five discrete sample locations.



The standard deviation for each stockpile shall be calculated based on discrete sample results. These standard deviations are then used to calculate the average standard error for all stockpiles (Equation 1). Twice the average standard error is added to the analytical result for the composite sample to provide a 95% upper confidence limit (Equation 2).

$$SE_{avg} = \frac{\sum_1^m \left(\frac{SD}{\sqrt{n}} \right)}{m} \quad \text{(Equation 1)}$$

$$UCL = [Composite_x] + 2(SE_{avg}) \quad \text{(Equation 2)}$$

n = number of sample values,

SE_{avg} = average standard error,

SD = standard deviation of the sample values,

m = number of stockpiles,

UCL = upper confidence limit and

x = the stockpile number.

Classification of stockpiles for disposal is based on a comparison of the 95% upper confidence limit values and the relevant clean up objectives. The first 20 stockpiles shall be analyzed for the eight inorganic elements for which the DCC criteria are applicable and PCBs. Selection of samples for analysis for petroleum hydrocarbon will be based on visual and/or olfactory evidence. This process shall be repeated for every 20th stockpile thereafter. All the remaining stockpiles will be tested for copper, lead and zinc and any other analyte that exceeded the DCC criterion previously until it is no longer present (Table 6.2). Field analysis can provide adequate detection limits for statistical classification of certain contaminants (PCBs and PHC), while others (inorganic elements) must be analyzed in CAEAL accredited laboratories for more precise results.



Table 6.2 Analytical Requirements for Stockpile Sampling

Stockpile No.	Samples Collected	Analytical Suite	Samples for Analyses
1 through 20	5 discrete 1 composite	PCBs, Cu, Ni, Co, Cd, Pb, Zn, Cr, As PHC and Hg where evident	All discrete and all composite samples are analyzed for first 20 stockpiles
Every 20 th thereafter	5 discrete 1 composite	PCBs, Cu, Ni, Co, Cd, Pb, Zn, Cr, As PHC and Hg where evident	All discrete and all composite samples are analyzed
Remaining stockpiles	1 composite	PCBs, Cu, Pb, Zn PHC, Hg and other inorganic elements where evident	Every composite sample is analysed.

Once the excavation is complete, the base of the landfill excavation must be sampled in accordance with confirmatory sampling protocol for Tier II soils.

6.1.6 Confirmatory Sampling of Material Processing Areas

Residual contamination may be present at barrel processing areas, hazardous materials processing areas, and stockpile lay down areas after clean up activities are complete. Once an area is no longer in use, a detailed inspection for evidence of staining and other indicators of contamination such as visible debris or paint flakes shall be carried out. Samples must be collected in these areas in a grid pattern based on the size of the area (see Table 6.1). In cases where field analytical methodology is used, 10-20% of the samples analyzed in the field should also be analyzed in the laboratory for quality control purposes.

6.2 Quality Assurance Testing of Earthworks

At most sites, earthworks will be carried out as part of the construction of new landfills, remediation of existing landfills, and/or development of hydrocarbon contaminated soil treatment areas. Contract Specifications developed for the project will identify specific requirements for fill gradation and compaction standards. As part of the testing to be carried out during cleanup, quality assurance (QA) testing is required to confirm that the earthworks are in conformance with the Specifications. The number and type of testing will be dependent on the volume of fill to be placed and the number of different material types employed in the cleanup. A QA program shall be developed in conjunction with the design engineer to determine the optimal number of tests required.



6.3 Testing Related to Permits/Regulatory Requirements

The Owner representative and the Contractor will be required to carry out testing to confirm that the requirements of the Land Use Permits and Water Licenses issued for the project are met.

This testing typically includes:

- Effluent testing for waste water generated from camp operations.
- Testing to confirm potability of drinking water supplies
- Testing of waste water generated from cleanup operations.



7 POST-CONSTRUCTION MONITORING

7.1 Introduction

A post-construction landfill monitoring program was developed by DND in conjunction with the Inuvialuit in the Western Arctic and the Inuit in Nunavut for landfills remediated and/or constructed during the cleanup of DEW Line sites. DND initiated cleanup of their DEW Line sites in 1996 and have collected a significant volume of landfill monitoring data since that time. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, INAC, have initiated cleanup of abandoned military sites under their jurisdiction, and will implement a site monitoring program following remedial construction activities.

This section describes the recommended monitoring plan. It has been based on the DND landfill monitoring program and on landfill monitoring data collected at DND and INAC DEW Line sites to date. Additional monitoring requirements related to the natural environment and traditional knowledge have been added to the program.

A detailed description of the post-construction monitoring program is provided in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008).

7.2 Monitoring Program

The recommended monitoring program for abandoned military sites consists of:

- Baseline Geo-chemical Monitoring.
- Natural Environment Monitoring.
- Landfill Monitoring.

These are briefly described in the following subsections.

7.2.1 Baseline Geo-Chemical Monitoring

Geochemical Characterization of Soil Conditions

In all proposed development areas, and existing landfill areas (with the exception of existing landfills to be excavated), it is recommended that geochemical characterization of soil conditions be carried out during the assessment or remediation phase. For proposed development areas, sampling should be carried out on a grid spacing of approximately 50 m by 50 m. For existing landfills, testpits should be excavated at a minimum spacing of 50 m of landfill perimeter with a minimum of five testpits per area. Soil stratigraphy is to be logged in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System, and evidence of



seepage and or soil staining recorded. Soil samples should be collected at surface and at 50 cm intervals to the maximum depth of the active layer, and analysed for the following parameters:

- PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls);
- Hydrocarbon Fractions, F1, F2, F3 and F4; and
- Inorganic elements: arsenic, cadmium, chromium, cobalt, copper, lead, nickel, and zinc.

These data supplement information collected during the assessment phase of a site.

Geochemical Characterization of Groundwater Quality

In proposed landfill development areas or at landfills requiring leachate containment, it is recommended that a detailed characterization of groundwater quality be carried out. A minimum of three wells per area is recommended; however, this may be increased if the size of the landfill warrants increased coverage. The locations of monitoring wells should be selected based on the potential for groundwater (based on the testpit program for soil characterization), and to be representative of both up and downgradient areas. The depth of the monitoring well will be based on anticipated maximum depth of thaw. The monitoring wells should be located no further than 10 m beyond the final construction perimeter as defined by the design.

For baseline water quality, water samples should be collected at minimum monthly for one full season to allow assessment of changes in water quality as the active layer deepens. The wells for baseline sampling are typically installed in the final construction season. This minimizes the potential for damage during construction.

Recommended analytical requirements are outlined below:

- Petroleum Hydrocarbon Fractions, F1 and F2
- Total and dissolved metals.
- Major ions, hardness, total dissolved solids, total suspended solids.
- pH and conductivity.

Given the low solubility of PCBs, analyses of PCBs may be limited to once over the season, near the time of maximum thaw.

For each monitoring event, water level, pH, conductivity, and turbidity should be measured.

If significant variability is observed in groundwater monitoring data, a second season of baseline monitoring should be carried out following remedial activities.



Typically, only dissolved metals are measured in groundwater monitoring programs; however, previous concerns existed with respect to transport of contaminants with colloidal material. The requirement for total metal analyses should be reviewed at the completion of baseline monitoring, and eliminated if concentrations can be correlated with Total Suspended Solids (TSS) concentrations.

7.2.2 Natural Environment Monitoring

A natural environment assessment (NEA) conducted during the ESA phase of site remediation will serve as a reference for post-construction site monitoring. Local and traditional knowledge will be obtained from a local community representative familiar with the site (ideally the same person who assisted with the NEA). If possible, this person may also act as wildlife monitor during landfill data collection. Natural environment data will be collected during the site visit as well as during community meetings with people who use or visit the site/area frequently (*i.e.*, year-round). The purpose of collecting this new data is not to find correlations with landfill monitoring data but rather to provide anecdotal data related to the presence of wildlife and changes over time.

Site specific data to be collected during the site visit should try to include as many of the following items:

- Wildlife sightings (species, number, gender, juveniles)
- Other evidence of recent presence of wildlife (droppings, tracks, feathers/fur, carcass remains, etc.)
- Wildlife activity (summering/nesting/denning, migratory/passing through)
- Qualitative assessment of relative numbers versus previous years (more, same, less)
- Revegetation of disturbed areas versus previous years (more, same, less)

Regional information to be collected during visits to the area throughout the year should include as many of the following items as possible:

- Use by people for traditional activities
- Season(s)
- Activities (hunting, fishing, trapping, camping, other harvesting)
- Relative frequency versus previous years (more, same, less)
- Wildlife species present (sightings or evidence)
- Wildlife presence versus previous years (more, same, less)
- Health of wildlife observed or harvested (good, average, poor)



- Relative health of wildlife versus previous years (better, same, worse)

7.2.3 Landfill Monitoring

In general, there are four types of landfills that require monitoring:

- New landfills for non-hazardous materials and Tier I soil;
- Landfills to be closed by the addition of granular fill and regraded;
- Landfills to be closed with leachate containment; and
- Tier II soil disposal facilities.

Based on site conditions at INAC’s abandoned military sites, it is considered unlikely that leachate containment would be considered; however, it is included for consistency with previous monitoring plans at military sites. A summary of requirements is provided in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 Summary of Landfill Monitoring Requirements

Landfill Type	Monitoring Requirements				
	Baseline Monitoring S- Soil GW - groundwater	Visual Inspection	Soil Sampling	GW Sampling	Thermal Monitoring
New Non-Hazardous Waste (NHW) Landfill (LF)	S, GW	✓	as required ^a	✓	
Regraded LF (low potential risk)	S	✓	as required ^a		
Leachate Contained LF (moderate potential risk)	S, GW	✓	as required ^a	✓	✓
New Tier II Soil Facility	S, GW	✓	as required ^a	✓	✓

^a Refer to Section 7.3.4 for details.

Baseline monitoring requirements were described in Section 7.2.1. The details of the other four landfill monitoring elements are described in the following subsections.



7.3 Specific Monitoring Requirements

7.3.1 Visual Inspection

The physical integrity of the landfill should be inspected and reported using photographs (from the air, when possible, as well as ground level) and hand drawn sketches. Documented observations should at minimum include the items identified in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Visual Inspection Requirements - Landfills

Item	Presence/	Extent	Description
	Absence		Photographic Reference
Settlement	Yes or No	Provide dimensions, as applicable of: Length Width Depth	Features of note, photographic reference with scale, view point and direction
Erosion			
Frost Action			
Animal Burrows			
Vegetation			
Staining			
Vegetation Stress			
Seepage Points			
Exposed Debris			
Condition of Monitoring Instruments			
Other features of note			

7.3.2 Groundwater Sampling

Results of analyses of groundwater samples from landfills should be compared to the baseline and background samples as this is indicative of changing environmental conditions at the site. In general, a minimum of three to four groundwater monitoring wells will be associated with Non-Hazardous Waste Landfills, Tier II landfills and Existing Landfills – Leachate Containment.



Consistent with the baseline analyses, groundwater samples should be tested for:

- Petroleum Hydrocarbon Fractions, F1 and F2
- Total and dissolved metals.
- Major ions, hardness, total dissolved solids, total suspended solids.
- pH and conductivity.
- PCBs

For each monitoring event, water level, pH, conductivity, and turbidity should be measured in-situ. The evaluation of whether both total and dissolved metals are required will be evaluated after baseline monitoring.

Given the low solubility of PCBs in water, analyses of PCBs may be discontinued if not detected in the first five years of monitoring.

7.3.3 Thermal Monitoring

One component of the leachate containment system incorporates aggradation of the permafrost through the landfill contents such that the active layer does not penetrate the waste materials. Geothermal analyses were carried out to predict the length of time for freezeback of the landfill; long-term and short-term thermal regime in the ground; and the depth of the active layer in the cover material. The analyses have shown that it takes several years for the landfill temperatures to equilibrate and stabilize.

A thermal monitoring system provides measurement of sub-surface ground temperatures, which allows comparison to and verification of the predicted ground temperatures. The thermal monitoring system consists of installation of thermistor strings, with “thermistor beads” at select intervals to provide ground temperature profiles at various locations within the landfill. The thermistor strings are attached to automated data-loggers which allow for remote data collection. In general, a minimum of three thermistors is placed; this is evaluated on a landfill-specific basis. Thermistor installation follows standard engineering practice.



7.3.4 Soil Sampling

As previously indicated, soil sampling and analyses provide limited information with respect to the performance of a landfill. Soil sampling will be limited to locations where seepage or staining has been identified as part of the visual inspection. Analytical requirements include:

- Petroleum Hydrocarbon Fractions, F1 to F4
- Arsenic, Cadmium, Cobalt, Copper, Chromium, Lead, Nickel, and Zinc
- PCBs
- Soil samples should be collected over the interval of 0 to 0.15 m, and 0.35 to 0.50 m depth.

7.4 Monitoring Frequency

Conceptually, three phases have been identified for landfill monitoring as described in the following subsections. Natural environment monitoring may be conducted according to the same schedule.

Phase I: Monitoring of conditions to confirm that thermal equilibrium and physical stability criterion are achieved.

During Phase I, monitoring would take place in years 1, 3, 5. The five-year term was selected on the basis that ground-temperature thermal regimes at these specific landfills would require three to five years to reach equilibrium.

Visual and thermal monitoring should be carried out on Tier II soil facilities and leachate contained landfills.

Visual inspections of the constructed and remediated landfills would also be carried out. It is anticipated that, if there is settlement or erosion within the initial years following remediation, it is likely attributable to construction quality. Changes after the first three years are more likely attributable to changes in the site conditions (i.e. warmer temperatures, changes in surface water drainage patterns).

It is recommended that groundwater monitoring take place in Years 3 and 5. The timing of the groundwater sampling event should consider the variability of water quality measured during the baseline monitoring.

An evaluation of the Phase I data would be carried out at the end of five years to confirm that thermal equilibrium has been achieved, and that no stability issues had been identified. The Phase I monitoring program may be extended, if required.



Phase II: Verification of equilibrium conditions established during Phase I.

At the completion of Phase I monitoring and review of the results, the Phase II monitoring frequency may be modified or downgraded. If no significant issues are identified for landfills of low potential environmental risk (as defined by the landfill evaluation matrix), monitoring may be discontinued at the conclusion of Phase I. If additional monitoring is warranted based on the thermal, groundwater or physical inspection, it is recommended that the monitoring frequency in Phase II be carried out according to the following schedule: Year 7, Year 10, Year 15, and Year 25. Year 25 would mark the end of Phase II monitoring.

Physical inspections of all landfills would be carried out at each monitoring event. The requirement for continued thermal monitoring would be based on Phase I results, or if significant climate changes had been recorded in the region.

Groundwater monitoring would be carried out at each monitoring event. The optimal time period for sampling would be based on the results obtained during baseline and Phase I monitoring.

Phase III: Monitoring for long term issues such as liner integrity, permafrost stability, and significant storm events.

At the end of Phase II, 25 years after implementation of the remedial actions for a given landfill, a re-evaluation of the monitoring program should be carried out prior to initiating Phase III. It is difficult to predict beyond 25 years how world events and improvements in technology may impact monitoring requirements.

7.5 Interpreting Monitoring Results

Landfill monitoring results (thermal, chemical and visual) have to be interpreted in concert with one another as described in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008).

7.6 Reporting Format

To provide a basis for comparison between monitoring events, it is recommended that a consistent format be used in reporting.

An outline is provided as follows:

1 Introduction. The introduction should provide an outline of the work elements, the timing of and weather conditions during field work, and describe the scope of the document.

For each individual landfill, the following information is to be provided.

2a. Landfill Summary: For each landfill, a summary should be prepared that describes the monitoring carried out, any notable groundwater analytical results, and any associated staining, seepage, exposed



debris, and/or evidence of vandalism. In addition, visual inspection issues identified as significant or unacceptable should be identified. The overall performance rating of the landfill should be provided.

- 2b. Completed Visual Inspection Report.
- 2c. A preliminary stability assessment, as described in Section 4.
- 2d. Annotated drawings on a tabloid paper, indicating all visual inspection features.
- 2e. Completed thermistor inspection reports, where appropriate.
- 2f. Photographic records.
- 2g. Thermal monitoring data, where appropriate.
- 2h. Groundwater analytical data.
- 2i. Monitoring well sampling logs.

In Annexes to the report, the following information is to be provided.

- Formal laboratory results.
- QA/QC evaluation of the analytical results.
- Handwritten field notes.

Example field note templates are provided in AMSRP Volume 2 (INAC 2008).



8 REFERENCES

- ACIA, 2005. Impacts of a Warming Arctic: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. Cambridge University Press, 1042p
- Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 1996. National Ecological Framework for Canada.
- AMAP 1998. *Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Assessment Report: Arctic Pollution Issues*. Oslo, Norway. Xii+ 859 p, 1998.
- Andzans 1984: *Andzans and Associates, DEW Line Data File, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, 1984.*
- Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, 2005.
- B.C. Environment 1995. Contaminated Site Statistical Applications.
- CACAR 2003. *Canadian Arctic Contaminants Assessment Report II, Highlights*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2003.
- CCME 1991: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Interim Canadian Environmental Quality Criteria for Contaminated Sites, 1991.*
- CCME 1992: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, National Classification System for Contaminated Sites, 1992.*
- CCME 1996: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, A Framework for Ecological Risk Assessment, 1996.*
- CCME 1996: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. A protocol for derivation of environmental and human health soil quality guidelines, 1996.*
- CCME 1996: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Guidance manual for developing site-specific soil quality remediation objectives for the contaminated sites in Canada, 1996.*
- CCME 1997: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Guidance Document on the Management of Contaminated Sites in Canada, 1997.*
- CCME 1999: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines, 1999.*
- CCME 2001: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines Update, 2001.*
- CCME 2001 *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Canada Wide Standards for Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Soil, 2001.*



CCME 2002: *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality, 2002.*

CCME 2008 *Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Canada Wide Standards for Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Soil, 2008.*

CEPA 1999: *Canadian Environmental Protection Act. 1999.*

CSM 2000: *Contaminated Sites Management Working Group, Federal Approach to Contaminated Sites, 2000.*

DGE 1996: *Director General of the Environment, Co-operation Agreement between the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation and the Department of National Defence Concerning the Restoration and Clean Up of DEW Sites within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, 1996.*

DGE 1998: *Director-General of the Environment, Co-operation Agreement Between Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Department of National Defence Concerning the Restoration and Clean Up of DEW Line Sites Within the Nunavut Region, 1998.*

ESG 1991: *Environmental Sciences Group, North Warning System Environmental Study, three Volumes, 1991.*

ESG 1993: *Environmental Sciences Group. The Environmental Impact of the DEW Line on the Canadian Arctic, 1993.*

ESG/UMA (1995): *Environmental Sciences Group and UMA Engineering Ltd., DEW Line Cleanup Scientific and Engineering Summary Report, Technical Document, RRMC and UMA Engineering Ltd., 1995.*

EWG 1998: *Environmental Working Group (EWG), DEW Line Cleanup, Nunavut, Environmental Working Group Report, Prepared for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Department of National Defence, 1998.*

EWG 1999: *Environmental Working Group (EWG), Evaluation of Hydrocarbon Contamination at DEW Line Sites in Nunavut – Addendum, Prepared for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Department of National Defence, 1999.*

Farouki, O.T., 1986. *Thermal Properties of Soils.* TransTech Publications, Germany, 136 p. January 2002.

FCS 2000: *Federal Contaminated Sites and Solid Waste Landfills Inventory Policy, 2000.*

Fletcher, 1990: *Fletcher R. J., Military Radar Defence Lines of North America: An Historical Geography, Polar Record 26, (156), 265-276, 1990.*



- HC 2002: *Health Canada*, Food Program, Food Safety and PCBs Found in Fish, 2001.
- IEG 2001: *Inuvialuit Environmental Group for INAC*, Design of the Cleanup of Atkinson Point: BAR-D, 2001.
- INAC, 1997: *Indian and Northern Affairs Canada*, Arctic Environmental Strategy – Northern Contaminants Program, Canadian Arctic Contaminants Assessment Report, Vol 25 1997.
- INAC 2002: *Indian and Northern Affairs Canada*, Contaminated Sites Program Management Framework Version 1, 2002.
- INAC 2008: *Indian and Northern Affairs Canada*, Abandoned Military Site Remediation Protocol, Volume II – Technical Supporting Documentation, 2008.
- Johnston, G.H. (Editor), 1981. Permafrost, Engineering Design and Construction. Wiley & Sons, Toronto, 540 p.
- PWGSC 2001: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Former Mid-Canada Line Radar Station, Bear Island, Nunavut, Preliminary Design and Outline Specifications, 2001.
- PWGSC 2001b: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Former US Coast Guard Loran Station Cape Christian, Nunavut, Preliminary Design and Outline Specifications, November 2001.
- PWGSC 2001c: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Former US Coast Guard Weather Station, Padloping Island, Nunavut, Preliminary Design and Outline Specifications, November 2001.
- PWGSC 2002: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Remediation Action Plan, Former Mid-Canada Line Radar Station, Bear Island, Nunavut, March 2002.
- PWGSC 2002b: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Remediation Action Plan, Former US Coast Guard Loran Station Cape Christian, Nunavut, March 2002.
- PWGSC 2002c: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Remediation Action Plan, Former US Coast Guard Weather Station, Padloping Island, Nunavut, March 2002.
- PWGSC 2002d: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Remediation Action Plan, Former Navigational Aid and Weather Station, Radio Island, Nunavut, March 2002.
- PWGSC 2002e: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Former Navigational Aid and Weather Station, Radio Island, Nunavut, Preliminary Design and Outline Specifications, November 2002.



PWGSC 2003: *Public Works and Government Services Canada for INAC*, Environmental Review of DIAND Contaminated Sites in the Territory of Nunavut, September 2003.

TB 1998: *Treasury Board* Real Property Environmental Policy, June 1998.

TB 2000: *Treasury Board* Federal Contaminated Sites and Solid Waste Landfills Inventory Policy, July 2000.

TB 2000b: *Treasury Board* Draft Guidelines on Liabilities and Contingent Liabilities Related to Federal Contaminated Sites, November 2000.

TB 2002: *Treasury Board* Federal Contaminated Sites Management Policy, June 2002.

TC 2002: *Transport Canada*, Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations: Clear Language. Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act 1992.

UMA 1994: *UMA Engineering*, Concept Design for 21 DND DEW Line Sites, 1994.



Annex A – Dump site, landfill and debris area (waste disposal area – WDA) evaluation



SUMMARY

In 1997, the DEW Line Cleanup Environmental Working Group (EWG), comprised of members representing Nunavut Tungaavik Inc. (NTI) and the Department of National Defence (DND) / Defence Construction Canada (DCC), was formed to address environmental issues associated with the DEW Line sites under the jurisdiction of DND. One of their tasks was the development of a matrix to assess potential environmental risk associated with existing landfills at the DEW Line sites. The evaluation matrix considered three primary categories, contaminant source, exposure pathways and potential receptors. In the development of the matrix, landfills typical of the DND DEW Line sites were considered. The DND DEW Line sites were in operation for nearly 40 years, and landfill activity was generally extensive.

By comparison, most INAC Abandoned Military Sites were generally only operational for a much shorter period of time, approximately five to six years. Accordingly, waste disposal practices were different. At many sites, waste materials were not consolidated in a single area, and dump sites and/or isolated areas of partially buried debris are common. These areas are collectively referred to as Waste Disposal Areas (WDA).

This current document presents an Evaluation Matrix for WDAs that considers conditions more specific to INAC Abandoned Military sites.



1 INTRODUCTION

To address the varied nature of landfills at abandoned military sites, a consistent method for the assessment of their potential risk to the arctic environment, in the form of a risk evaluation matrix, was developed by the DND/NTI EWG in 1997 (EWG 1998). Since that time, the matrix has been utilized to develop recommendations for landfill remediation at DND DEW Line sites. This document provides a modified evaluation matrix to address the dump sites, landfills and buried debris areas more typical of the abandoned military sites under the jurisdiction of INAC. As a whole, these are referred to as Waste Disposal Areas (WDAs).

The DND/NTI evaluation matrix was based on the CCME National Classification System for Contaminated Sites, and adapted to address the particular concerns of the Arctic environment. This revised version also references the Federal Contaminated Site Action Plan (FCSAP) Contaminated Site Classification Guidance Document. 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 intended purpose of the matrix is to evaluate the potential environmental risk posed by WDAs in their current condition.

Two conservative assumptions are made during the evaluation of all WDAs

- The contents of WDAs are generally unknown and all potential contaminants may be present.
- If contaminants come into contact with receptors, they could have adverse effects on the receptors.



2 MATRIX FACTORS

2.1 Contaminant Source – Category A

Four factors were considered under Contaminant Source to describe specific disposal areas as follows:

- A.1 Areal extent of waste disposal.
- A.2 Estimated depth of buried debris
- A.3 Contaminant Characteristics – combined presence of leachate and surface contaminated soil.
- A.4 Presence of Surface Debris

Contaminant characteristics were assigned the greatest weighting in this category as it is a strong indicator of potential environmental risk associated with the WDAs. The volume of a WDA is considered to be related to its potential to be contaminated – the greater the volume, the greater the risk that contaminants are present. The volume of the waste disposal area is divided into two parameters, area and depth. The area is relatively easy to measure; the estimated depth of the buried waste is given less weight in the matrix as it is difficult to measure using non-intrusive techniques.

A.1 Areal Extent of Waste Disposal

The larger the area impacted by waste disposal, the greater the potential for contaminants to be present exists. The areal extent of dump sites can be easily surveyed based on the presence of surface wastes. Landfill or buried debris areas are based on the results of geotechnical/geophysical site surveys and visual observations. A value of 10 000 m² is used as the basis for comparison. All WDAs greater than 10 000 m² are awarded the maximum points for this category. Scoring for all other WDAs is prorated relative to 10 000 m². WDAs less than 1000 m² are referred to as debris areas.

Scores are provided for all WDAs following the detailed field investigations that are carried out prior to cleanup/construction. The objectives of these investigations are to delineate the extent of known contamination, and confirm existing site and WDA conditions.

A.2 Estimated Depth

The depth of landfills and debris areas can be estimated by visual inspection of surrounding topographic features. The average depth of the active layer is 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 and buried debris with estimated depths of greater than 1.5 meters were scored higher than those with estimated depths of less than 1.5 meters. For the majority sites, it is anticipated that the depth of buried waste is 1.5 metres or less. Exceptions to this may include dumping within ravine areas or other natural depressions. A minimum score of 2 is allotted to all WDAs in the absence of specific data.



A.3 Contaminant Characteristics

Contamination associated with WDAs may be elevated with respect to background concentrations, but less than applicable criteria. In this case, elevated concentrations may be indicative of chronic low levels of contaminants leaching from the WDA, as a result of infiltration and percolation of surface water, or flow of active layer groundwater through areas of buried debris. In some cases, contamination on the surface may exceed applicable criteria as a result of direct spills or leaking containers.

With consideration of the FSCAP Hazard Ranking of contaminants and the DCC Criteria, all contaminants included in the DCC are considered high concern, with the exception of Petroleum Hydrocarbon Fractions F3 and F4. The F3 and F4 fractions are considered essentially insoluble and are therefore immobile. In the scoring of this category, four categories are provided:

- Concentrations not elevated with respect to background; however, the potential for contamination is considered possible.
- Concentrations elevated with respect to background; but less than DCC criteria. Elevated with respect to background refers to a concentration in excess of the three times the mean background concentration. With respect to organic contaminants, such as hydrocarbons and PCBs, the method detection limit is assumed to represent background concentrations.
- Concentrations in excess of DCC Tier I guidelines.
- Concentrations in excess of DCC Tier II guidelines.

A.4 Presence of surface debris

At some WDAs, in particular dump sites, 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 WDA that has surface debris covering more than 50% of its surface receives a full score. Debris areas, and dump sites as implied by the designation, generally receive full score for this category.

2.2 Pathways – Category B

The primary transport mechanisms for contaminants at these sites are considered to be:

- B.1 Aerial transport of fine particles; and
- B.2 Dissolved phase and/or colloidal transport in water, 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 impacted soils imply the potential for aerial transport. This factor is given a low weight because the quantity of contaminated soil on the surface 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

Dissolved phase and/or colloidal transport in water includes 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 generally subject to the same driving forces or gradients as surface water. The intent of this sub-category is to examine factors that affect migration away from the WDA – slope, runoff, extent and type of cover on below grade disposal areas, annual precipitation and distance to surface water. Among these factors, topography, runoff potential and proximity to surface water are given the greatest weight.

B.2.1 Topography

The degree of the slope on which the WDA is located is one of the major factors contributing to transport of contaminants. Scoring is carried out on a progressive scale. In cases where there are different slopes in the area, a weighted average is used.

B.2.2 Cover Material – Depth

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

B.2.3 Cover Material – Type

The erosion potential of a WDA is partly based on the type of cover material. Erosion can eventually lead to the exposure of the waste. 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 WDA, 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 in the area.

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, and potentially erosion. The majority of the abandoned military sites receive less than 500 mm of precipitation annually, with the exception of sites on the lower east coast of Baffin Island. Typically, the amount of precipitation at any site is relatively low. Any given rainfall event is unlikely to generate major run-off; however, spring thaw and corresponding run-off may be significant at some sites. Detailed precipitation data is not available for the INAC sites; therefore data was interpolated from the Hydrological Atlas of Canada Maps [accessed on line: <http://atlas.nrcan.gc.ca/site/english/maps/archives/5thedition>] as summarized below for various areas. For sites not listed below, the aforementioned maps should be consulted.

Sites	Annual Precipitation (mm)	Annual Snowfall (cm)	Average Maximum Snow Pack depth (cm)
Clifton Point	100-200	100	30
Bernard Harbour east to Matheson Point	100-200	80	30
Simpson Lake to Sarcpa Lake	150-200	100	50
Bray Island, Rowley Island	150-200	100	60
Nadlaurdjuk Lake	200-300	100	60
Ekalugad Fiord	200-300	200	70
Kivitoo	350	240	100
Durban Island	+400	240	100

As spring run-off likely represents the maximum precipitation event, scoring is provided relative to the maximum snow pack depth, with a score of 4 allotted to snow pack depth of 100 cm. If site specific factors, such as drifting in the WDA are present, the score may be increased to 5, the maximum allotted to this category.



B.2.6 Distance to Down-gradient 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 WDA, or streams and lakes downgradient from the WDA, 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 elevation difference. 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 away from the WDA.

2.3 Receptors – Category C

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

Selection of the water body in this category is based on potential effects on the receiving habitat. Consideration must be given to the regional drainage patterns. For example, where the drainage from a WDA is overland (i.e. there is no direct connection between the WDA and the downgradient water body), water bodies beyond two 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 WDA 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 a significant body of water near the limit of the WDA where contaminants are likely to have an impact. 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 limit of the WDA toe. The objective is to select a habitat that supports receptors rather than identify the closest body of water. It is assumed that only habitat downgradient from the WDA is to be considered (given that aerial transport of contaminants to habitat upgradient from the WDA will be addressed by the remediation of contaminated soil).



C.1.2 Estimated Habitat Usage – Freshwater/Marine

The score within this category is based on the frequency of usage within the selected receiving environment and considers the level of biodiversity and the occurrence of calving/spawning grounds. Freshwater and/or marine wildlife are potentially more at risk compared with terrestrial wildlife or avifauna, the latter of which are exposed through water ingestion. Thus, when terrestrial wildlife or avifauna are 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

The extent of vegetation considers the area within 300 metres downgradient of the WDA. Within this distance, vegetation is expected to be most susceptible to uptake of contaminants if they are leaching from the WDA. However, topography and the potential for run-off must be considered and a greater or lesser distance could be considered.

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 are 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 surface is not frozen. Within this factor, the scoring takes into account the likelihood and the duration of contact. Using this method, 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 Table 1 below. Unmanned Short Range Radar (SRR) sites, part of the North Warning System, are co-located at some of the former abandoned military sites, and periodic maintenance of these facilities is carried out. As a



conservative approach, it may be considered that maintenance workers may have a low likelihood of contact and low duration of contact.

Table 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

Different areas on a site may need to be considered individually.

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 WDA is to be considered in this factor.

C.3.3 Food Consumption

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

Sedentary organisms are more susceptible to local inputs as their exposure is greater if they are downgradient from the WDA. 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 sites do not have elevated levels of contaminants, as 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 abandoned military 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 site has the potential to pose a higher risk than a low consumption, although in general the risk remains low.



2.4 Special Considerations

As indicated in the introduction to the matrix, 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 their 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 that are not general to all of the abandoned military 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 a WDA, 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

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 WDA.

Example 2. Proximity to a community

In the WDA risk evaluation matrix, human exposure to a WDA is measured in the following way: people can spend time at the WDA (potential dermal exposure), they can drink water from an area near the WDA (potential ingestion), they could live very close to the WDA (potential exposure through aerial transport) or they could eat animals that feed near the WDA (potential ingestion). These considerations form section C.3 of the risk evaluation matrix. If a WDA is located near a community, there is a greater likelihood that people will spend time at the site than there is for areas far from a community. It is not necessarily the case, however, that WDAs near communities receive frequent visits; therefore, instead of creating a special section addressing proximity to a community, the risk of human exposure (see Table 1-1) is more accurately evaluated by measuring time spent at a WDA. In these cases, however, “special considerations” points may be added to the receptors category to address a community’s specific concerns, such as the physical hazards associated with an exposed dump site.



2.5 Traditional Knowledge

The matrix for the evaluation of potential environmental risk was developed recognizing that local input would be relied upon in the scoring of WDAs. Additional guidance on the collection of Traditional Knowledge is provided in Section 4.10 of the protocol.



3 INTERPRETATION OF SCORES

The score obtained through the application of the matrix is intended to represent the potential environmental risk posed by a given WDA in its current state. The objective of remediation is to mitigate the risk associated with a WDA by preventing the migration of contaminants that may be present in the landfill, and by removing physical hazards.

During the development of the matrix by the EWG, WDAs at four different sites were evaluated by environmental scientists and engineers to assess the applicability of the matrix and to determine cut-off values between categories. WDA scoring 105 points or more is classified as potentially high risk (Class A) and require excavation. The high score accorded to these WDAs is generally a result of the ecological sensitivity of the area and the geometry and surrounding topography of the landfill, which precludes the development of a cost-effective and long-term design solution such as pathway intervention and/or stabilization of the landfill. WDAs with a score of 100-104 points must be considered on a case by case basis – some may require complete excavation while others may be considered Class B landfills. WDAs that score less than 105 require excavation/removal if one or more of the following conditions are met:

- The WDA is located at an elevation of less than 2 m higher than an ocean.
- The WDA consists of unconsolidated wastes at surface. Debris should be removed, classified, and sorted, and non-hazardous contents placed in an engineered landfill.
- WDA, with areal extent of less than 1000 m² and scoring a total of 89 points or more are classified as potentially high risk and require excavation to the full extent/depth of the debris. In addition, if these WDAs score greater than 23 points in the contaminant source category, complete excavation of the area is recommended.

A WDA with a score in the range 75 to 99 points is classified as moderate potential environmental risk (Class B). An engineered leachate containment system will be provided for these WDAs to mitigate against potential environmental risks. In specific cases where an engineered leachate containment system cannot be constructed, an evaluation of excavation will be carried out with the objective of determining whether complete excavation or partial excavation with a leachate containment system is required.

For WDAs of less than 1000 m², it is considered unlikely that leachate containment will be cost-effective when compared to excavation and removal of debris. Consideration must therefore be given to the level of contamination present. If contaminants are present in excess of criteria, it is recommended that the debris area be excavated to its full extent. If contamination does not exceed criteria, debris should be cut-off and removed within the upper 0.5 metres of the ground surface. The area should then be regraded to match surrounding topography.



A WDA with a score of 75 or less is classified as low potential environmental risk (Class C). In general, the remediation approach for these areas includes placement of an engineered cover, following collection, sorting, and appropriate disposal of debris from the surface, and excavation and disposal of any surface contaminated soils from the area. Some of the factors to be considered in the design of the cover include: thickness and type of the existing cover materials; slopes on the landfill; surrounding topography and available granular fill. The cover is designed to promote surface water run-off (i.e. no areas of standing water), prevent erosion, and mitigate against settlement. Where required, the slope of the WDA may be modified and/or geotextiles may be incorporated into the granular cover to provide a long-term solution. Generally, the final thickness of cover material is approximately 0.75 metres, and may be greater, dependent on site specific conditions. The granular cover material is to be placed in layers and compacted before the placement of the next layer of granular fill, until the design thickness is reached.

Overall, it is to be stressed that the matrix is to be used in the assessment of potential environmental risks associated with a specific WDA. It is not intended to be used as the sole criterion in determining the remediation solution for a WDA. The results of the matrix, both total score and the score from each major category, are to be considered in conjunction with the engineering evaluation of site conditions, to determine appropriate design solutions. Review of the individual category scores relative to the total score will highlight particular areas of concern that are to be addressed during the design process.

The potential impacts of climate change are also to be considered in evaluating remedial solutions.

It should be emphasized that the total score has an error associated with it of approximately 5 points; there is inevitable subjectivity in the scoring process and scores that fall near decision points should be considered on a case by case basis.



4 REFERENCES

BC Environment. June 1996. Guideline #1 Contaminated Sites: Site Characterization and Confirmation Testing. Draft.

CCME. 1992 National Classification System for Contaminated Sites.

COSEWIC, 1997, Categories of the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada.

DIAND, 1997. Canadian Arctic Contaminants Assessment Report.

EWG 1998: *Environmental Working Group (EWG)*, DEW Line Cleanup, Nunavut, Environmental Working Group Report, Prepared for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Department of National Defence, 1998.



ATTACHMENT 1
WASTE DISPOSAL AREA
EVALUATION MATRIX



ENVIRONMENTAL RISK EVALUATION MATRIX		Maximum Score
WASTE DISPOSAL AREAS - ABANDONED MILITARY SITES		
A.	CONTAMINANT SOURCE	
A.1	AREAL EXTENT OF WASTE DISPOSAL AREA	
	>10,000 m ²	10
	For areas less than 10,000 = Area of Waste Disposal Area X 10 / 10 000	2-9
	Minimum Score	1
A.2	ESTIMATED DEPTH OF BURIED WASTES	
	greater than 1.5 m	5
	less than 1.5 m	2-4
A.3	CONTAMINANT CHARACTERIZATION	
	Concentrations in excess of DCC Tier II Criteria	25
	Concentrations in excess of DCC Tier I Criteria	20
	Concentrations elevated relative to background	10
	Potential Contamination	5
A.5	PRESENCE OF SURFACE DEBRIS	
	>50% of surface area	10
	<50% of surface area, pro-rated	1-9
	No debris observed	0
	SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	+/- 5
	TOTAL SCORE - CONTAMINANT SOURCE	



ENVIRONMENTAL RISK EVALUATION MATRIX		Maximum Score
WASTE DISPOSAL AREAS - ABANDONED MILITARY SITES		
B.	PATHWAY/TRANSPORT MECHANISMS	
B.1	AERIAL TRANSPORT OF CONTAMINANTS	
	All Waste Disposal Areas Scored as 2, if surface soil contamination (A.4) or leachate (A.3) has been identified.	
B.2	WATER MOVEMENT	
B.2.1	TOPOGRAPHY	
	Steeply Slope (>40 % Grade)	12
	Sloping (10% to 40% Grade)	4-11
	Subdued to 10% Slope	2-3
	Flat (< 3%)	1
B.2.2	COVER MATERIALS –DEPTH	
	No to little existing cover	4
	Greater than 50% exposed/surface debris	3
	Occasional exposed/surface debris	2
	Existing cover, minimal debris,	1
	Cover thickness > average active layer thickness	0
B.2.3	COVER MATERIAL – TYPE	
	No cover	5
	Silty/Sandy Material	4
	Sandy/Gravel Material	3
	Gravel Material	1-2



B.	PATHWAY/TRANSPORT MECHANISMS continued	
B.2.4	SURFACE WATER/RUN-OFF POTENTIAL	
	Very High - evidence of erosion, continuing run-off, or wave action	12
	High - evidence of erosion, seasonal, widespread, storm waves	10
	Moderate - % area affected by erosion	3-9
	Low - no evidence of erosion, slight slopes	1-2
B.2.5	PRECIPITATION	
	> 100 cm snow pack	4
	< 100 cm snowpack (pro-rated)	1-4
	Snow Drifting	1
B.2.6	DISTANCE TO DOWNGRADIENT PERENNIAL SURFACE WATER/SEASONAL DRAINAGE CHANNEL	
	0 to 100 m	10
	100 to 300 m	7-9
	300 to 1 km	2-6
	greater than 1 km	1
	SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	+/- 5
	TOTAL SCORE – PATHWAYS	



	ENVIRONMENTAL RISK EVALUATION MATRIX	
	WASTE DISPOSAL AREAS - ABANDONED MILITARY SITES	Maximum Score
C.	RECEPTORS	
C.1	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON RECEIVING FRESHWATER/MARINE HABITAT	
C.1.1	PROXIMITY TO RECEIVING FRESHWATER/MARINE HABITAT	
	0 to 100 m	6
	100 to 300 m	4-5
	300 to 1 km	2-3
	greater than 1 km	1
C.1.2	ESTIMATED HABITAT USAGE - FRESHWATER/MARINE	
	High; High Biodiversity/ High Occurrence/Calving or Spawning Area	5-6
	Moderate: Moderate Biodiversity, Migratory	3-4
	Low: Low biodiversity; rare sightings	1-2
C.2	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON RECEIVING TERRESTRIAL HABITAT	
C.2.1	Extent of Vegetation	
	Extensive vegetation growth, (80 to 100 % ground cover)	6
	Moderate vegetation growth (40 to 80% ground cover)	4-5
	Low vegetation growth (20 to 40% ground cover)	2-3
	Sparse vegetation (<20% ground cover)	1
C.2.2	ESTIMATED HABITAT USAGE - TERRESTRIAL/AVIFAUNA	
	High; High Biodiversity/ High Occurrence/Calving, Denning or Nesting Area	5-6
	Moderate: Moderate Biodiversity, Migratory	3-4
	Low: Low biodiversity; rare sightings	1-2



C.	RECEPTORS continued.	
C.3	POTENTIAL HUMAN EXPOSURE THROUGH LAND USE	
C.3.1	Presence/Occupation	
	Duration of Contact /Likelihood of Contact	7-8
	see chart and provide rationale for scoring	4-6
		1-3
C.3.2	Proximity to Drinking Water Source	
	0 to 100 m	8
	100 to 300 m	5-7
	300 to 1 km	2-4
	greater than 1 km	1
C.3.3	Food Consumption	
	High quantity of sedentary organisms - marine & plant life	8
	Moderate quantity of sedentary organisms - marine & plant life	6
	Low quantity of sedentary organisms - marine & plant life	4
	No consumption	0

	High quantity of migratory organisms	2
	Moderate quantity of migratory organisms	1
	Low quantity of migratory organisms	0.5
	No consumption	0
	SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	+/-5
	TOTAL SCORE – RECEPTORS	
	TOTAL SCORE	



Annex B – Barrel Protocol



1 INTRODUCTION

In order to determine the correct disposal method for barrels and their contents, the contents must first be identified. All barrel contents should be sampled and analyzed according to DND DEW Line Cleanup standard procedures, as described in this section.

Analytical data obtained for the samples collected from barrels located at the site should be compared to the criteria included in Table 1, below. Barrel contents are identified as organic or aqueous and the concentrations of glycols, alcohols, PCBs, chlorine, cadmium, chromium and lead are determined. The flash point of organic waste and aqueous waste (> 2% glycols/alcohols) must also be determined. Uncontaminated aqueous phases can be disposed of on the land according to the discharge criteria; uncontaminated organic phases can be incinerated; contaminated aqueous material should be scrubbed free of organic material; and contaminated organic material should be disposed of as hazardous material.

During the delineation phase of the site investigation, an inventory of the number and locations of barrels at the site is to be compiled. This inventory should include buried or partially buried barrels that will be taken out of the landfills during excavation. Where significant numbers of barrels are present on a site, and if safe to do so, representative samples shall be collected to provide a preliminary indication of whether on-site incineration is a viable alternative. Otherwise, barrels are only sampled during the cleanup phase and as such, the handling, transportation and opening of barrels is the responsibility of the site Contractor.

Other waste fuels and oils are also sampled according to this protocol. These may come from a variety of sources including, but not necessarily limited to, old generators, fuel tanks and pipelines, and transformers.

2 INSPECTION

All barrels are to be inspected to address the following items which shall be recorded and used as a guide prior to opening barrels.

- Symbols, words, or other marks on the barrel that identify its contents, and/or that its contents are hazardous: e.g. radioactive, explosive, corrosive, toxic, flammable.
- Symbols, words, or other marks on the barrel that indicate that it contains discarded laboratory chemicals, reagents, or other potentially dangerous materials in small-volume containers.
- Signs of deterioration or damage such as corrosion, rust, or leaks at seams, rims, and V grooves, or signs that the barrel is under pressure such as bulging and swelling.
- Spillage or discoloration on the top and sides of the barrel.



3 SAMPLING

Barrels shall not be transported until it has been determined that they are not under pressure, do not leak, and are sufficiently sound for transport.

Barrels to be sampled should be set in an upright position, provided that this does not cause them to leak and that it is physically possible.

Barrels should only be opened according to accepted procedures and under qualified supervision, preferably using remotely operated, non-sparking equipment.

Once open, barrels will be sampled by personnel wearing proper personal protective equipment as described below. Samples of the contents of all barrels shall be extracted using a drum thief and placed into a pre-labelled glass vial. The number and type of liquid phases, and their respective thickness, and the size of each barrel are to be recorded.

In instances where there are a large number of barrels with obviously similar contents, these can be grouped together and 30 to 40% of the barrels in the group sampled. Barrels containing less than 50 mm of liquid may be combined with compatible material prior to sampling; samples inferred to contain only water on a visual examination shall be tested prior to this consolidation. Barrel contents, which consist of black oil, shall not be consolidated.

All barrels shall be clearly numbered using spray paint or other suitable paint marker. The number on this label should be the only sample coding provided to the laboratory.

The barrel locations and barrel sample descriptions should be recorded.

Samples should be kept at ambient temperatures and shipped by guaranteed freight to laboratories where they should be kept cold pending analysis.

4 TESTING

Liquid samples shall be inspected and classified as either containing water or organic materials. Samples thought to contain water shall be analyzed to confirm that they are indeed water, and contain less than 2% glycols or alcohols.

The contents of barrels containing organic materials, including aqueous samples which contain more than 2% glycols or alcohols, shall be tested for flash point, PCBs, total chlorine, cadmium, chromium and lead following the targeted barrel testing approach presented in Figure 1. Analyses will be conducted on a rush basis where indicated. In addition, major organic components should be identified e.g. fuel oil, lubricating oil.

If on site incineration of waste is not planned, waste samples need only be tested for flash point, PCB, and pH (at regular turnaround time) in order to classify the waste for transport and disposal options.



Contents of barrels which contain two or more phases shall have all phases analyzed; the organic phases as described above and the aqueous phase to ascertain whether it contains less than 2% organic substances. In addition, the aqueous phase shall be tested for any components found in the organic phases above the criteria provided in the protocol.

5 DISPOSAL OF BARREL CONTENTS

Barrels containing only rust and sediment shall be treated as empty barrels.

Barrel contents comprising water only (less than 2% glycols or alcohols) shall be transferred to an open vessel such as a utility tub or half-barrel and any organic material removed by agitation with a pillow or segment of oil absorbent material. The water shall be tested prior to discharge in accordance with wastewater discharge criteria. Where water meets criteria, it may be discharged to the ground a minimum of 30 meters distance from natural drainage courses. Used oil absorbent material shall be treated as described in the following subsection.

Barrel contents which are composed of water with glycols and/or alcohols or organic phases, and which contain less than 2 ppm PCBs, 1000 ppm chlorine, 2 ppm cadmium, 10 ppm chromium, 100 ppm lead, and that have a flash point between 25°C and 225°C, may be disposed of by incineration. Alternatively these contents may be disposed of off-site at a licensed disposal facility. The solid residual material resulting from incineration shall be subjected to a leachate extraction test. Material found to not be leachable shall be disposed of as DCC Tier II contaminated soil. Leachable material shall be treated as hazardous waste and disposed of off-site at a licensed disposal facility.




Figure 1 Targeted Barrel Testing Approach



Barrel contents, which contain greater than 2 ppm PCBs, 1000 ppm chlorine, 2 ppm cadmium, 10 ppm chromium or 100 ppm lead, or that have a flash point below 25°C or greater than 225°C shall be disposed of off-site at a licensed disposal facility. Contents may be combined with compatible materials for shipping purposes.

Used oil absorbent material should be treated as hazardous waste and disposed of off-site at a licensed disposal facility. If it is shown to be uncontaminated with PCBs (< 2 ppm), chlorine (< 1000 ppm), cadmium (< 2 ppm), chromium (< 10 ppm) and lead (< 100 ppm), it may be incinerated on-site.

6 DISPOSAL OF BARRELS

Empty barrels may be crushed or shredded and landfilled on-site as non-hazardous waste after they have been cleaned in an appropriate manner. The barrels shall be crushed in such a manner so as to reduce their volume by a minimum of 75%. Shredded barrels may be disposed of off-site as recycled metals.

7 PERSONNEL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

Safety equipment required includes a respirator with organic vapour cartridges, safety glasses, a hard hat, rubber safety boots, double gloves (chemically resistant on the outside, and latex or vinyl on the inside) and disposable Syranex-coated coveralls.

A decontamination procedure should be established at the barrel sampling area(s) to prevent tracking potentially contaminated liquids outside of the sampling area(s).

It is advisable to have one person outside of the sampling area to observe the sampler(s) in case of unexpected hazards, and also to record the samplers' observations.