Technical and Strategic Considerations for the Use of Risk Assessment at a NAPL-Impacted Brownfield



Paul Cheung Peter Sutton

RemTech East 2023 Niagara Falls, ON May 31, 2023

PRESENTATION GOALS













Wider Applicability

Can this project serve as an example for consultants and real estate developers to move forward on NAPL-impacted properties?



WHO WE ARE













Founded in 1995

Employee-Owned

120+ employees



Health and Safety Focused



Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion Inogen Alliance Partner for Canada





Multi-disciplinary engineering and science consultancy

- Environmental
- Geotechnical
- Hydrogeology
- Ecology
- Building Science
- EHS

Diverse client base

- Real Estate Development
- Property Management
- Petroleum
- Insurance
- Government Agencies
- Municipalities









OUR PRESENCE

Toronto Office

90 Scarsdale Road Toronto, Ontario 416-245-0011

Hamilton Office 65 Nebo Road Hamilton, Ontario 905-632-5939

Durham Office 1333 Thornton Road S, Unit 2 Oshawa, Ontario 905-739-3202

Ottawa Office 20 Gurdwara Road, Unit 1 Ottawa, Ontario 613-745-6471



PROJECT CONTEXT



Retail Fuel Outlet and Garage operating since 1950s

Leaking USTs (for decades?)

Extensive area of impact and presence of LNAPL discovered in 1990s



25 years of remedial activity with diminishing returns



PROJECT CONTEXT



Need to divest – preferably for residential USE



How can we file an RSC? What are the project considerations?

PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS



What is the most practical and cost-effective solution that meets the regulatory requirements and effectively deals with the contamination?

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION

- Presence of LNAPL at 11 mbg
- PHCs determined to be predominantly gasoline with some waste oil contributions
- Chlorinated solvents at >14 mbg
- Off-site migration of impacted
 groundwater







REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

- O. Reg. 153/04 requires the filing of Record of Site Condition for change in property use
- Requires all contaminant concentrations meet applicable Site Condition Standards

OR

 Set Property-Specific Standards (with or without Risk Management) through a Risk Assessment MECP policy requires that free-phase product be removed to the extent "technologically practicable"

No consideration of costs

TIMELINE AND COST CERTAINTY

- Uncertainty regarding success of conventional remedial excavation approaches
- Ontario's regulatory requirements require six months of groundwater monitoring post-excavation
- Risk Assessment process can be lengthy for more complicated sites

- Reasonable certainty is essential to developers
- Costs associated with construction activities and loans are significant
- Many moving parts involving planning and permits, financing, sales, etc.

POTENTIAL OPTIONS

Remediation through Development

- Remove petroleum and VOC impacts
 as part of bulk excavation
- Requires over-excavation and remedial groundwater monitoring with open excavation
- Significant uncertainty if all contamination could be remediated, or within allotted timeframe

Checklist



Environmental contamination



Regulatory requirements



Timeline and cost certainty



POTENTIAL OPTIONS

Risk Assessment

- Risk Assessment that assumes ongoing presence of NAPL
- NAPL CSM requires detailed delineation and ground-truthing
- Risk assessment process represents a delay pre-construction
- Extensive investigation and RMMs are expensive
- Still best option to limit costs during construction phase

Checklist



Environmental contamination



Regulatory requirements



Timeline and cost certainty





LNAPL CSM

- Long-term monitoring and remediation provided strong delineation of impacted areas
- Gave confidence to MECP that LNAPL was characterized and stable







LNAPL Vapour Modelling



Gouvêa Júnior, J.C.R., 2019. Soil Vapor Intrusion. NICOLE Brasil.

- Vapour intrusion models generally invalidated by presence of product
- Developed a model to estimate sub-surface vapour concentrations assuming the presence of LNAPL
- Required an understanding of the product type and main constituents



Ground Truthed Data

- Soil vapour data were collected in LNAPL areas to determine the accuracy of the modelling and assumptions
- Provided confidence to MECP that the approach and outputs were sound



Lahvis, M.A., et al., 2013. Vapor Intrusion Screening at Petroleum UST Sites. Groundwater Monitoring & Remediation 33, no. 2: 53-67





Certificate of Property Use



Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks

Ministère de l'Environnement, de la Protection de la nature et des Parcs

Certificate of Property Use

Issued under the authority of the Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.19, sections 168.6 (CPU) and 197 (Order)



• Locking your client into a CPU isn't often the best approach BUT. provides certainty for the Regulator

• Allows MECP to have confidence in the approach and risk management

 Engagement with MECP to understand their concerns

- NAPL stability
- Off-site migration
- Exposure scenarios

PROJECT OUTCOME





 Brownfields represent the best opportunity to address Canada's housing crisis

Large number of urban brownfields throughout Canada

• Many brownfields have NAPL present



 Standard models don't consider separate source types and phase-separate liquids

 Need to ground truth available data with consideration of exposure pathways of concern

 Property-Specific Standards in presence of NAPL are meaningless



WIDER APPLICABILITY

• MECP policy still poses a challenge

• Limits redevelopment of NAPL sites

• What happens if a site doesn't have 25 years of clean up history?

 Is it time to reconsider the objectives and desired outcomes of the policy?

CONTACT US

PAUL H. CHEUNG, M.ENV.SC., QP_{RA}

Environmental Risk Assessor

P.CHEUNG@TERRAPEX.COM



PETER SUTTON, P.ENG., QP_{ESA}, QP_{RA} VICE PRESIDENT, ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES <u>P.SUTTON@TERRAPEX.COM</u>

