



COLIN
DUNWOODY

Performance Assessment Lessons Learned



Question: Must a CSRA be signed by a site owner?



- Answer: No, Section 55(2) of the EMA allows the "source site owner" to be broadly defined as "a responsible person for the contaminated site from which the contaminated soil is proposed to be removed". Therefore, a contractor responsible for relocating soil generated during work has been interpreted to reasonably meet the definition of "source site owner" for the purposes of entering into a CSRA.



Question: Soil and groundwater assessment on a site shows volatiles are non-detect in soil and groundwater. Is vapour assessment required?



- Answer: Maybe - Two comments:
- Were all volatile and semi-volatile PCOC analyzed in soil and groundwater?
- Are there off-site APECs where volatile PCOC could be sourced that could affect the site?



Question: Is a Schedule B vapour clause required to support the use of a subslab VAF for a future building on an affected site where soil and groundwater are not impacted with volatile substances?



Answer: Yes. If application of a VAF is required to meet the Schedule 11 standards, then a Schedule B vapour clause is required.



Question: What is the applicable CSR land use for an “institution”?



Answer: Residential



Comment: When you are excluding Drinking Water (DW) at a site you must:

- Demonstrate how you followed P21 and TG6
- Identified whether there is a “mapped” aquifer at the site
- addressed the applicability of DW to any shallow zone and delineated DW exceedences laterally in the shallow zone
- Delineated soil and groundwater in establishing your aquitard thickness
- Addressed how any (actual or potential) deeper water bearing zones are protected

And you have to lay this all out clearly and in detail in the SoSC





- Question 1: The attenuation factor to apply for soil vapour during investigation should be the Af... :
 - applicable to current site use/development
 - applicable to the future use described on the instrument (Schedule B)
 - applicable to delineate relative to adjacent property uses
- Question 2: What Af do you use for indoor air results?



- Answer 1: All of the above.
- Answer 2: None



Question: Can a COC be obtained for subtidal lease areas?

Answer: Yes. This has been done on a number of sites. Although such land may be Federal, a Provincial COC can still be issued.



Question: Can an instrument be obtained for an APEC if all groundwater wells are found to be dry?

Answer : Yes. It is possible to provide a rationale that groundwater has not been impacted. Each project is unique of course and a comprehensive and reasoned argument is required.



Question 1: What is the point of compliance for meeting the Aquatic Life standards when using a groundwater flow model within a Risk Assessment?

-The Site boundary, or the receptor?

– Question 2 – What about Drinking Water?



- Answer 1 – The receptor.
- Answer 2 – Site boundary

The rational is that the receptor location is unlikely to change but a neighbour could drill a well at his property line.



Question: A risk assessment concludes that no operable exposure pathways exist for receptors of concern given that contaminants are present entirely beneath a building and/or asphalt. Is a risk control required with respect to the building/asphalt?

- If so, would the risk control be considered intrinsic, institutional or engineered? Would performance verification be required?



Answer: If the conclusion of acceptable risks is based on the presence of the building/asphalt, a risk control requiring that the surface cover remain in place would be required. The risk control would be considered an engineered control, and inspection to ensure that the surface cover remains intact would be required.



Comment: A reminder to ensure that recommended risk controls are appropriate and reasonable based on the magnitude and extent of the contamination at a site. Risk controls should only be included as required to ensure acceptable risks to human health and the environment.



Question: Can you obtain a Determination for a Site without intrusive investigation?



Answer: – theoretically Yes but practically you have your work cut out for you.

- if the site profile doesn't identify Schedule 2 activities then why are you getting a determination?
- If you still want a determination then there is a high standard of care and you have to investigate both on and off-site APECs
 - If no Sch 2 activities the standard of care will be high to confirm this but it could be possible
 - If Sch 2 activities then would have to have very comprehensive and definitive proof that there was no potential for contamination (guilty until proven innocent)