

Rhonda Miller - MVLWB

From: Lynn Boettger - MVLWB [lboettger@mvlwb.com]
Sent: July-15-11 11:09 AM
To: 'Rhonda Miller - MVLWB'
Subject: FW: ENR Inquiries and Future Plans

Rhonda – Can you post right away under Town of Fort Smith – MV2011L3-0001. It is an additional response to ENR Intervention from the Town of Fort Smith.

Thx!
LB

From: Lindsay McIntyre [mailto:lmcintyre@fortsmith.ca]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 11:06 AM
To: Lynn Boettger - MVLWB
Cc: Jean Soucy
Subject: FW: ENR Inquiries and Future Plans

Hi Lynn,

Below is the response by Brian Geddes (consultant for AECL) regarding ENRs comments on the Uranium Cell at the Landfill. Also outlined is confirmation that they are developing a plan for ultimate storage of the uranium at our landfill with other sites identified in the South Slave Region.

Hope this is sufficient!

Lindsay McIntyre, GISP
Director of Municipal Services
Town of Fort Smith
Ph. 867.872.8400
Fx. 867.872.8401
lmcintyre@fortsmith.ca

From: Geddes, Brian [mailto:brian.geddes@amec.com]
Sent: July-15-11 10:04 AM
To: Jean Soucy, Town of Fort Smith; lmcintyre@fortsmith.ca
Cc: Zelmer, Robert; 'Michael Owen'; Randy.Lall@cnsccsn.gc.ca; Ron.Stenson@cnsccsn.gc.ca
Subject: ENR Inquiries and Future Plans

Jean, Lindsay

Pursuant to our discussions earlier this week we have drafted the following responding to the ENR's inquiries and to the issue of planning for the ultimate disposition of the cell.

Regards
Brian

ENR Inquiries

ENR's intervention related to the Town of Fort Smith's "A" water license reapplication requests confirmation that the current groundwater monitoring program includes parameters that characterize the potential influence of the Fort Smith Landfill Cell (FSLC) on the local hydrogeological regime. The primary contaminant of concern for materials stored in the FSLC is uranium, a parameter that is included in the Town's monitoring program. A preliminary review of the

Town's recent compilation of groundwater monitoring data (AECOM, 2011) indicates that uranium levels in wells immediately adjacent to and down gradient from the site (i.e., BH-4 and BH-5) do not exhibit uranium levels materially different from those in the upgradient, background well (i.e., BH-2). This data review then provides no indication of a local groundwater impact resulting from the presence of the FSLC.

It is useful to note that this finding is consistent with expectations grounded in experience at other similar sites across Canada, and the nature of the materials themselves. These materials are natural uranium ores that are not particularly soluble and, therefore, not readily prone to dispersal in even transmissive soil environments (if they were, they would not have remained in the relatively concentrated states that originally prompted their removal from the source sites in Fort Smith). Given the limited solubility of these materials, they are typically not stored in facilities with highly engineered containment systems. The straightforward primary geosynthetic liners and caps (with soil covers) used for soils in the Fort Smith cell, and the tarp demarcation layers used for the wood demolition materials in the cell, are consistent with facility specifications applied for similar materials under the LLRWMO's control at storage facilities across Canada.

Future Plans

In our discussions on 12 July, the Town inquired about the LLRWMO's plans for the ultimate disposition of the FSLC currently located within the municipal landfill site. The LLRWMO recognizes that the cell's current location will eventually conflict with the landfill's operational requirements. As discussed, the LLRWMO is currently undertaking an evaluation of options for the long term management of all uranium impacted materials in the South Slave area. It is anticipated that consolidating the current FSLC inventory at a storage facility location selected in consultation with the broader community will be considered as this review unfolds. The timing of this process is driven in large part by the community's perspectives and requirements around the issue of siting and is, therefore, difficult to predict with any certainty. At present, we are assuming that this planning process will require a period of one to two years before a go forward consensus on facility siting is achieved.

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed.
Its contents (including any attachments) may contain confidential and/or privileged information.
If you are not an intended recipient you must not use, disclose, disseminate, copy or print its contents.
If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete and destroy the message.