# LVM KILMER BROWNFIELD EQUITY FUND L.P.

#### **SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION & BROWNFIELD RE-DEVELOPMENT** Former industrial site in St. Laurent, Montreal, Qc



François Dubé, B. A. Sc. David Harper, M.Sc., P. Geo.





#### Introduction

Kilmer Brownfield Equity Fund

Canadian private equity fund with committed capital > \$90 million

First dedicated Canadian brownfield fund and an experienced management team

Fund investment sweet spot of \$5 to \$15 million in land, planning and remediation costs



### Fund's Mandate: "Do Good and Do Well"



#### Sustainable Development (SD)

A pattern of economic growth in which resource use aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment so that these needs can be met not only in the present, but also for generations to come



**Urbanization Strategies** 

Greater Energy, Water and Material Efficiencies in the Built Environment

**Public Transit Networks** 

Alternative and District Energy Systems

**Restoration of Natural Systems** 

**Greater Density and Intensifications** 



#### **Brownfield Sites**

Abandoned or underuse industrial or commercial sites in established locations with existing infrastructures

Various past site usages with unclear site management practices

Environmental liabilities impacting value of site

Site restoration both technically challenging and costly





Estimated 30,000 to 50,000 Brownfield Sites in Canada

#### Common Barriers to Brownfield Development

**Potential Environmental Liabilities** 

 Civil and regulatory liabilities affecting both former owners and developers

**Process Uncertainties** 

 Timing and outcomes unclear for environmental and planning matters

**Remediation Funding Gap** 

 Conventional financing is not readily available during site restoration





**Redevelopment Timeline** 

The Problem: Brownfields Cannot be Valued on a Cost Basis





Planned redevelopment includes:

- 9 residential buildings (900-1,000 residential units)
- 1,000 underground parking spaces

 New green space with linkages to the subway station and a vegetal visual and sound barrier along the rail corridor





#### +

#### Sustainable Development & Brownfield Remediation

Traditional Remediation	Sustainable Remediation
<ul> <li>✓ Off-site disposal of demolition material</li> <li>✓ Excavation and off site disposal of impacted soil exceeding government guidelines</li> <li>✓ Fill material importation on the site</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>✓ Environmental Risk Assessment Approach (ERA)</li> <li>✓ Reuse of demolition material</li> <li>✓ Use of Green Remediation Techniques</li> <li>✓ Reuse of on site treated soil</li> <li>✓ Risk Mitigation Plan</li> <li>✓ Innovative construction design</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>✓ No site restriction</li> <li>✓ Short remedial timeline (&lt; 6 months)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>✓ Possible site restrictions (no basement, minimum layer of clean soil under structures, etc.)</li> <li>✓ Negotiation with environmental agencies and municipalities</li> <li>✓ Possible site monitoring after remediation</li> <li>✓ Longer remedial timeline (6 months – 2 years)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>✓ Costly \$\$\$</li> <li>✓ Production of gas emissions (GHG and others)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>✓ Low gas emissions</li> <li>✓ On site management of the contamination – no liabilities transferred to another site</li> <li>✓ More cost effective than traditional remedial work ("dig and haul")</li> </ul>





#### Assessment Data from 1990 to 2009

Soil

- 345 sampling points
- > 400 samples analysed

Groundwater

- 116 observation wells
- >100 samples analysed

Soil vapors

3 sampling events

8 samples analysed



#### Groundwater Contamination and Flow Direction

Depth of groundwater: 2.5 to 3.5m bgs

Variable groundwater flow (W, N-E and E)

Groundwater contaminants: TCE, PAH, TPH  $C_{10}$ - $C_{50}$ , Sulphide, Chloride





Former Industrial Site – Site Description

Figures adapted from Golder, 2009



TAIT STREET

WAREHOUSE

SCHOOL AND DAY CARE





#### **Transportation Mechanisms**

- A: Evaporation, volatilisation
- B : Upward movement of soil particles
- C : Atmospheric dispersal

+

- D : Precipitation/deposition
- E : Outdoor air infiltration (gases and particles)
- F : Infiltration to groundwater
- G : Groundwater table fluctuation
- H : Off-site migration by groundwater
- I : Infiltration to sewers

#### Exposure Pathways

- 1 : Soil ingestion
- 2 : Outdoor air inhalation (gases and particles)
- 3 : Soil dermal contact
- 4 : Indoor dust inhalation
- 5 : Indoor air inhalation (gases and particles)
- 6 : Ecological receptors direct contact with soil
- 7 : Ingestion (plants, surface water, soil)

#### Stratigraphic units

1 Backfill

2)

3

- Natural soil
- Bedrock

# Approved Rehabilitation Plan and Risk Assessment

Impacted soil from former site operations (generic residential standards)

 Organic solvents (TCE) and petroleum hydrocarbons: excavation, on site biopile treatment and soil reuse as backfill material following treatment

Historical fills from area industries (risk based standards)

 Various metals and PAHs: remained in-place with a capping risk management measure



# Approved Rehabilitation Plan and Risk Assessment

Impacted groundwater (generic sewer use guidelines)

- Free phase recovery and on-site treatment of petroleum hydrocarbons from accumulated water in excavations
- Attenuation of solvent impacts using Zero-Valent Iron (ZVI) as a soil amendment during backfilling and supplemental risk management measures
- Mitigation at the property boundary using of a permeable reactive barrier (ZVI)



Approved Rehabilitation Plan and Risk Assessment

#### Demolition

 Reuse of crushed concrete as backfill material (residential criteria)

#### **Re-Development**

 Restrictions on metals and PAH's contaminated soil (>residential) left in place



At least 0.4 m of clean fill under roads, parking, bike and pedestrian paths At least 1 m of clean top soil cover in landscape area At least 1m of clean fill under new buildings and along foundations



#### Demolition

Recycling: 89 % of materials, such as 27,000 metric tons of crushed concrete used as backfill material or final cover and metal recycling











### Soil

14,500 m<sup>3</sup> of hydrocarbon and VOC's bio-treated soil reused on site

11,700 m<sup>3</sup> of PAH's and metals impacted soil reused on site based on risk assessment

2,400 m<sup>3</sup> of heavily impacted soil treated off site at an authorized facility





#### Soil













## Soil - "Dig and Haul" and Carbon Dioxide Emissions (Site Specific)

Total volume of soil requiring off-site disposal	28,600 m <sup>3</sup>
Volume of TPH and VOC's contaminated soil	16,900 m³
Volume of PAH's and metals contaminated soil	11,700 m <sup>3</sup>
Volume carried by each dump truck	16 m³of soil
Total round trips required	1,788 trips

Average distance from site to disposal facilities	45 km
Total traveling distance for disposal (round trip)	160,920 km
Distance from site to clean fill location	35 km
Total traveling distance for backfill (round trip)	125,160 km
Total distance	286,080 km
Fuel consumption of dump truck (Source 1)	35 L/100 km
Emission coefficient (Source 2)	2.7 kg CO²/L
Total CO <sup>2</sup> Emissions	270,346 kg
Total CO <sup>2</sup> Emissions	270 tons



#### SOURCES:

1.Reid, Lesley, Sustainability in Remediation -Calculating CO2 Emissions Associated with Varied Remediation Activities Presented at GeoEdmonton 2008

2. Environment Canada: Emission Factors for Energy Mobile Combustion Sources for Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles

http://www.ec.gc.ca/pdb/ghg/inventory\_report/2 005\_report/a12\_eng.cfm#a12\_1\_4

On-site remediation can lead to 75% reduction in CO<sup>2</sup> emissions compared to dig and haul

#### Groundwater

Water treatment and management of 360,000 liters of excavation water

Amendment with ZVI to attenuate remaining cVOCs impacts to shallow groundwater after source removal and treatment





#### Groundwater

Installation of permeable reactive barrier to mitigate any cVOCs impacted groundwater at the site boundary after source removal and treatment

Installation of monitoring wells for groundwater monitoring

Groundwater monitoring during and after remediation at the property limits







On Site Monitoring and Mitigation Measures During Remedial Work

- Ambient air sampling at the site boundaries
- Dust control (water spray)
- **Visual Barrier**
- Excavation water and process water pumped and treated prior to disposal to sewer system

Process air (Biopile) vacuumed and treated through carbon filters



Schedule

September 2008 – Former owner put property on market

**April 2009** – Following ESAs (Ph I, II & III), contamination notice for site was registered to environmental agency (MDDEP)

**October to December 2009** – Kilmer negotiation with former owner to purchase brownfield site

**November 2009** – Kilmer & LVM introductory meeting with environmental agency prior to purchase of site



Schedule

Summer 2010 – Demolition of plant

June 2010 to June 2011 – Negotiations with local authorities and environmental agency

**April 2011 –** Public meeting presenting remediation project

June to December 2011 – Remediation Plan approved and Completion of site remediation

May to July 2012 – Attested report and notice of restriction







#### Conclusion

#### Environment

Brownfield remediation that will allow greater urban intensification

Reduced off-site disposal and increased waste recycling on site through the remediation process.

Use of green remediation technologies that reduced greenhouse gas emissions by 75%





#### Society

Involvement of the population through public presentation Reappropriation of land for community use





#### Conclusion

#### Economy

The rehabilitation of a brownfield was made possible through a sustainable approach that lowered the remediation costs and made the project viable

The remediation was completed on time and on budget





MESIQ (ERA, Dr. Sylvain Loranger)

Panzini (Demolition contractor)

Biogénie (Remedial contractor)

WESA (Zero-valent barrier design)

Sustainable Development Technology Canada (SDTC)

## Thank you lvm.ca

