



April 5, 2016

# REPORT



## BURNCO AGGREGATE PROJECT

# Chemical Data Screening for Multimedia Assessment

**Submitted to:**

Derek Holmes  
Regional Manager BC Aggregate Operations  
BURNCO Rock Products Ltd.  
1A, 2760 Emerson Street  
Abbotsford, BC V2T 3J6

**Report Number:** 1114220046-565-R-Rev0

**Distribution:**

2 copies - Burnco Rock Products Ltd.  
1 copy - Golder Associates Ltd.





# Table of Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 SCREENING VALUES USED IN THE HUMAN HEALTH MULTIMEDIA RISK ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1     Summary of Guidelines and Standards Used.....	1
2.1.1     Surface Water .....	1
2.1.2     Soil .....	2
2.2     Elimination of Non-Toxic Chemicals .....	3
<b>3.0 RESULTS OF SCREENING .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1     Water .....	4
3.2     Soil.....	4
<b>4.0 SCREENING OF BASELINE DATA.....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1     Soil.....	5
4.2     Fish, Crab, and Mussel Tissue .....	5
4.2.1     Results .....	6
<b>5.0 CLOSURE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6.0 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>8</b>

### TABLES

Table 9.1-C-1: Human Health Application Case Water Screening

Table 9.1-C-2: Human Health Application Case Soil Screening

Table 9.1-C-3: Input Values and Sources Used to Calculate Fish and Shellfish Screening Levels

Table 9.1-C-4: Human Health Toxicity Reference Values Used for Fish and Shellfish Screening

### ATTACHMENTS

#### Attachment 1

Screened Baseline Soil and Tissue Concentrations



### Acronyms and Abbreviations

BC	British Columbia
BC CSR	British Columbia Contaminated Sites Regulation
BC MoE	British Columbia Ministry of Environment
CCME	Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment
COPC	Contaminant of potential concern
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> (for example)
i.e.	<i>id est</i> (that is)
RSL	Regional Screening Level
The Proposed Project	BURNCO Aggregate Project
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

### Units of Measure

%	Percent
---	---------



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This appendix summarizes the selected screening values and outcome of the chemical screening for the human health multimedia risk assessment being completed as part of the overall Environmental Assessment Certificate/Environmental Impact Assessment (hereafter referred to as the EA) for the Proposed BURNCO Aggregate Project (the Proposed Project).

### 2.0 SCREENING VALUES USED IN THE HUMAN HEALTH MULTIMEDIA RISK ASSESSMENT

A chemical screening process was used to determine the chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) in environmental media as outlined in Section 9.1.4 of the main report.

For the Application Case assessment, the screening for COPCs entailed comparison between predicted concentrations of contaminants in exposure media (e.g., soil and water) against both regulatory guidelines/standards and a 10% or greater increase above the Base Case concentration at any location. Detailed methods for the prediction of environmental concentrations in soil are provided in Appendix 9.1-D. Methods for the prediction of aerial deposition rates and water quality concentrations are provided in Part B, Sections 5.7 and 5.5, respectively.

#### 2.1 Summary of Guidelines and Standards Used

Provincial (British Columbia Ministry of Environment [BC MoE]) and Canadian (e.g., Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment [CCME] and Health Canada) environmental quality regulations and guidelines were used preferentially as part of the COPC identification process. In the absence of BC or Canadian environmental quality criteria for a particular chemical, an environmental quality criterion from other international regulatory agencies (e.g., United States Environmental Protection Agency [US EPA]) were used. Environmental quality regulations or guidelines used in this assessment are summarized below by media type with the exception of the air quality criteria which are presented in Appendix 9.1-B.

##### 2.1.1 Surface Water

Water quality was predicted for the Proposed Project for the following locations:

- the pit lake (MCF-5);
- the downstream receiving environment including two locations on McNab Creek (MCF-1 and MCF-7);
- a location downstream of the pit lake along a permanent channel (MCF-12); and
- a location within the groundwater channel downstream of the pit lake (MCF-6).



Water quality was predicted for each of the 16 years of the Proposed Project operation and for 2 years of closure using inputs from water quality monitoring conducted between 2010 and 2014. Water quality inputs were developed using the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile or probability distributions based on the available monitoring data (i.e., the Base Case concentrations). Where insufficient data were available (i.e., less than three observations) a maximum concentration was used instead of the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile. The predicted maximum yearly concentrations of total metals and nutrients for each of the five locations identified above across the Proposed Project operations and closure were screened against the Base Case concentrations and against the most conservative of the health-based guidelines (Table 9.1-C-1).

The guidelines applied for the screening process included:

- BC Contaminated Sites Regulation (CSR; BC MOE 2011, including updates to 2014) which provides numerical standards representing acceptable concentrations of chemicals for drinking water use (Schedule 6 and 10 of the BC CSR);
- BC Water Quality Guidelines (BC MoE 2014) which provides numerical guidelines for drinking water;
- Health Canada Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality (Health Canada 2014). The Health Canada drinking water guidelines typically assume a total daily intake allocated to drinking water of 20% (i.e., assuming 20% of a person's tolerable daily intake from a chemical comes from water, and the remaining 80% comes from other sources such as food); and
- US EPA Residential Tap Water Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) for Chemical Contaminants at Superfund Sites (US EPA 2014) (in the absence of guidelines from the agencies listed above). For non-carcinogens, US EPA RSLs were adjusted to a hazard quotient of 0.2, and for carcinogens, RSLs were adjusted to reflect a cancer risk level of 1 in 100,000 (consistent with Health Canada guidance). US EPA RSL values were only provided if there were no health-based guidelines or standards from the above sources.

MCF-1 and MCF-7 are located along McNab Creek and the local Strata hold a license to use this water for potable purposes. In addition, the pit lake and MCF-6 and -12 are considered possible sources for incidental ingestion of water through recreational use. For this reason, predicted water quality concentrations were screened against drinking water guidelines. The selected screening value was the lowest human health-based value from the above listed sources.

### 2.1.2 Soil

Maximum Application Case soil concentrations at selected receptor locations were screened against health-based residential soil quality thresholds (Table 9.1-C-2). The following soil quality thresholds were considered:

- CCME (1999) – Canadian soil quality guidelines for protection of human health. Where available, screening values for relevant pathways were used (i.e., soil ingestion, direct contact). The Canadian soil quality guidelines are typically based on an allocation of 20% of the provisional tolerable daily intake of soil (i.e., assuming 20% of a person's tolerable daily intake of a chemical comes from soil, and the remaining 80% comes from other sources such as food and water);



- BC CSR which provides numerical standards for soil (Schedules 4, 5 and 10) (BC MoE 2011; including updates to 2014). Where available, standards for relevant pathways were used (i.e., soil intake).

BC regional background soil concentrations for the Lower Mainland (BC MoE 2005; 2010) are provided in Table 9.1-C-2. The background soil quality database includes soil data analyzed by two different digestion methods, aqua regia and nitric perchloric. The aqua regia method is considered the preferred analytical method for metals (BC MoE 2010). However, aqua regia results were not available for all metals reported in the background soil quality database. Aqua regia results were not available for bismuth, mercury, and thallium; therefore the nitric perchloric results were utilized for these parameters.

The lower of the BC CSR and/or CCME standards and guidelines was conservatively chosen as the selected screening value. If a BC CSR and CCME standard or guideline was not available, the BC background soil concentration was used for screening purposes. Regional background concentrations were used as a secondary screen to determine whether a chemical that exceeded a guideline/standard and increased by greater than 10% from Base Case concentrations should be retained for further evaluation in the risk assessment. Background values were used instead of screening values available from other jurisdictions because they were specific to soils in BC. In media other than soil, local background concentrations were not available and therefore screening values from other jurisdictions were deferred to in the absence of a provincial or federal standard.

## 2.2 Elimination of Non-Toxic Chemicals

Some metals and essential minerals are commonly analyzed in environmental samples (as part of the standard suite of metals treated by the analytical method) but generally have low toxicity at concentrations typically found in the environment, even at industrial sites such as a mine. Many of these chemicals are present in parent rock and soil materials and are present in a toxicologically inert form, and some are essential micro- and macro-nutrients.

Although the following metals and essential minerals may be present in media in the area of direct influence, they were excluded from further consideration in the COPC screening process based on their expected low toxicological hazard:

- Calcium, sodium, potassium, magnesium, and phosphorus are essential minerals that serve a variety of biochemical, intracellular, and ion balance purposes in human tissues. These parameters are naturally occurring chemicals and are included in routine analytical chemical analyses. Government agencies often do not develop regulatory criteria for these and other innocuous chemicals. As these chemicals are not known or expected to be associated with on-site activities, they have been excluded from the human health risk assessment.



### 3.0 RESULTS OF SCREENING

#### 3.1 Water

The predicted water concentrations for the Application Case as well as the Base Case concentrations are provided in Table 9.1-C-2. Water sampling locations are provided in Figure 9.1-2. Results of the screening for each water quality location are provided below:

##### Pit Lake

A guideline was not available for ammonia, hardness and total titanium and the predicted maximum 95<sup>th</sup> percentile concentration was greater than 10% above the Base Case concentration. All other parameters were either below the applicable health-based guideline or did not increase by greater than 10% above Base Case. Therefore, ammonia, hardness and titanium were retained as COPCs in the pit lake.

##### MCF-6, MFC-12

A guideline was not available for ammonia or hardness and the predicted maximum 95<sup>th</sup> percentile concentration was greater than 10% above the Base Case concentration. All other parameters were either below the applicable health-based guideline or did not increase by greater than 10% above Base Case. Therefore, hardness was retained as a COPC.

##### MCF-1

A guideline was not available for alkalinity and the predicted maximum 95<sup>th</sup> percentile concentration was greater than 10% above the Base Case concentration. All other parameters were either below the applicable health-based guideline or did not increase by greater than 10% above Base Case. Therefore, alkalinity was retained as a COPC.

##### MCF-7

The water quality predictions were either below the applicable health-based guideline or did not increase by greater than 10% above the Base Case.

#### 3.2 Soil

Based on the screening process outlined in Section 2.1.2, no COPCs were retained in soil for the Application Case. None of the metals emitted by the Proposed Project were predicted to increase the concentration in soil by greater than 10% from the Base Case to the Application Case. Although the maximum Application Case concentration for arsenic (15.8 mg/kg) exceeded the selected screening value (12 mg/kg), it was below the regional background concentration of 20 mg/kg and; therefore, not retained for further evaluation in the human health risk assessment.



## 4.0 SCREENING OF BASELINE DATA

Baseline data including soil, mussels, crabs, and fish collected to support the human health assessment were also screened against applicable guidelines. While significant changes to these media as a result of the Proposed Project are not anticipated because of the minimal changes to soil and water anticipated as a result of the Proposed Project, (see main document; section 9.1; rationale provided in section 9.1.4.6.2), these screened baseline data are presented in Attachment 1 of this appendix for informational purposes. Berries were collected as part of the baseline study; however there are no screening guidelines available for vegetation. Soil was considered a surrogate for assessing vegetation.

### 4.1 Soil

Baseline soil concentrations were all below the CSR and CCME screening values with the exception of arsenic which exceeded the CCME residential and industrial guideline of 12 mg/kg at three locations (13-BRP-S-01, 02 and 05). The maximum concentration which occurred at 13-BRP-S-05 (15.7 mg/kg) did not exceed the BC MoE regional background concentration of 20 mg/kg. Screened baseline data are presented in Table 1 of Attachment 1 of this appendix.

### 4.2 Fish, Crab, and Mussel Tissue

Baseline fish, crab, and mussel tissue concentrations compared to screening levels are provided in Tables 2 to 4 of Attachment 1 of this appendix. Screening levels were calculated using the Health Canada (2012) equation for ingestion of contaminated foods (provided below). The equation was rearranged to solve for the concentration of contaminant in food ( $C_{Foodi}$ ). The equation input values and sources used are provided in Table 9.1-C-3 and Table 9.1-C-4. Ingestion rates for high consumers (eaters only) of fish and shellfish were used so as not to underestimate potential exposure scenarios (e.g., subsistence consumption), so therefore an exceedance of a screening level does not necessarily imply a potential health risk but rather may require some further evaluation if the contaminants are related to those released by the proposed Project.

Toxicity reference values (TRVs) were used from Health Canada (2012) if available. If not, TRVs were used from the hierarchy of sources following Health Canada guidance (2010; Table 9.1-C-4). For non-carcinogenic parameters, the TRV, body weight, and ingestion rate for the toddler (if available) were used to be conservative in the calculation of the screening values. For carcinogenic parameters (e.g., arsenic and benzo(a)pyrene), the TRV, body weight, and ingestion rates for adults were used.

$$\text{Dose (mg/kg bw/day)} = \frac{[\sum [C_{Foodi} \times IR_{Foodi} \times RAF_{Orali} \times D_i]] \times D_4}{BW \times 365 \times LE}$$

Where:

$C_{Foodi}$  = concentration of contaminant in food  $i$  (mg/kg)

$IR_{Foodi}$  = receptor ingestion rate for food  $i$  (kg/day)

$RAF_{Orali}$  = relative absorption factor from the gastrointestinal tract for contaminant  $i$  (unitless)

$D_i$  = days per year during which consumption of food  $i$  will occur

$D_4$  = total years exposed to site (for assessment of carcinogens only)

$BW$  = body weight (kg)

365 = total days per year (constant)

$LE$  = life expectancy (years) (for assessment of carcinogens only)



### 4.2.1 Results

#### Fish

Available baseline fish data included a single sample collected from McNab Creek, which was analyzed for metals. The concentrations of arsenic, chromium (compared to chromium VI screening value), lead, and mercury exceeded the calculated fish screening levels. The mercury fish tissue concentrations were conservatively compared to a screening value based on methylmercury. Concentrations of the remaining parameters analyzed were below the calculated fish screening levels.

#### Crab

Available baseline crab data include seven samples collected from a reference site (Camp Potlatch) and nine samples from the proposed Project area. Both muscle and organ tissue samples were collected from each crab and analyzed for metals. The concentrations of arsenic (ranging from 1.06 to 12.20 mg/kg ww) exceeded the shellfish screening level (0.06 mg/kg ww) in all tissue samples collected from the reference site and the proposed Project area. The concentration of copper exceeded the shellfish screening level (33.4 mg/kg ww) in three organ samples only; one sample from the reference site (58.1 mg/kg ww) and two from the proposed Project area (33.5 and 35.9 mg/kg ww). The concentration of mercury exceeded the screening level of 0.07 mg/kg ww in both muscle and organ tissue samples collected from the reference site (Camp Potlatch) for three crabs and in one muscle tissue sample collected from the proposed Project area. The concentrations of strontium exceeded the screening value in one organ tissue sample collected from Camp Potlatch and in two organ samples collected from the proposed Project area. No muscle tissue samples exceeded the strontium screening value. In general, concentrations of metals and PAHs in crab in muscle and organ tissues collected at the reference site and the Project area, were quite similar.

#### Mussel

Available baseline mussel data included ten samples collected from a reference site (Camp Potlatch) and ten samples collected from the proposed Project area. All mussel samples were analyzed for metals and five samples were analyzed for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). The following metals had concentrations in the proposed Project area that exceeded the screening levels: arsenic, cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc. All mussel samples collected from Camp Potlatch had concentrations exceeding the screening levels for arsenic and cadmium, and one sample also had exceedances for aluminum, chromium, cobalt, iron, and vanadium. There were no exceedances of the PAH screening levels in samples collected from Camp Potlatch or from the proposed Project area. In general, concentrations of metals and PAHs in mussels collected at the reference site and the Project area, were quite similar.



## CHEMICAL DATA SCREENING FOR MULTIMEDIA ASSESSMENT

### 5.0 CLOSURE

We trust this information is sufficient for your needs at this time. Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at 604-296-4200.

#### GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

Ann-Marie Norris, B.Sc.  
Project Biologist

Audrey Wagenaar, M.Sc., DABT, PChem.  
Associate, Senior Environmental Scientist

Golder, Golder Associates and the GA globe design are trademarks of Golder Associates Corporation.

o:\final\2011\1422\11-1422-0046\1114220046-565-r-rev0\1114220046-565-r-rev0-screening multimedia\_5apr\_16.docx



### 6.0 REFERENCES

- BC MoE (British Columbia Ministry of the Environment). 2005. Technical Guidance 17: Soil quality database. October 2005.
- BC MoE. 2010. Protocol 4 for Contaminated Sites: Determining background soil quality. October 12, 2010.
- BC MoE. 2011. Contaminated Sites Regulation Schedule 6 – Generic numerical water standards. 2011, includes amendments up to January 31, 2014. Available at:  
[http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws\\_new/document/ID/freeside/375\\_96\\_08](http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/375_96_08). Accessed September 2014.
- BC MoE. 2014. Water quality, Water quality guidelines (criteria) reports. Available at:  
[http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wat/wq/wq\\_guidelines.html#approved](http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wat/wq/wq_guidelines.html#approved). Accessed September 2014.
- CCME (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment). 1999. Soil Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Environmental and Human Health. Last updated 2014. Available at: <http://st-ts.ccme.ca/en/index.html>. Accessed September 2014.
- Health Canada. 2010. Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada. Part I: Guidance on Human Health Preliminary Quantitative Risk Assessment. Version 2.0, Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Health Canada. 2014. Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality – Summary Table. Federal-Provincial-Territorial Committee on Drinking Water of the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Committee on Health and the Environment. Water, Air and Climate Change Bureau, Healthy Environments and Consumer Safety Branch. Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- US EPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency). 2014. Regional Screening Levels – Residential tap water table. Last updated November 2014. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/region9/superfund/prg/>. Accessed January 2015.





**Table 9.1-C-2: Soil Screening - Application Case  
Public Health Assessment  
Proposed Burnco Aggregate Project**

Parameter	BC CSR-Standards for the Protection of Human Health				CCME- Guidelines for the Protection of Human Health				BC Regional Background Lower Mainland	Selected Screening Value <sup>a</sup>	Maximum Base Case Soil Concentration (mg/kg dry weight)	Maximum Predicted Application Case Soil Concentration (mg/kg dry weight)	Location of Maximum Application Soil Concentration	Is Predicted Application Soil Concentration >Base Case + 10%?	Is Predicted Application Soil Concentration >BC CSR or CCME?	Is Predicted Application Soil Concentration Below BC Background Concentration?	Is Parameter a COPC?
	Residential Land Use	Notes	Industrial Land Use	Notes	Residential Land Use	Notes	Industrial Land Use	Notes									
Aluminum (Al)									45,000	45,000	44,000	44,001	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	Yes	No
Antimony (Sb)	20	G	40	G	20	G	40	G	15	20	1.14	1.14	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Arsenic (As)	100	I	300	I	12	SI	12	SI	20	12	15.8	15.8	McNab Creek Strata	No	Yes	Yes	No
Barium (Ba)	6500	I	>1,000,000	I	6800	DC	130000	DC	300	6500	217	217	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Beryllium (Be)	4	G	8	G	75	DC	1400	DC	1.5	4	0.378	0.378	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Bismuth (Bi)									-	-	0.308	0.308	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	NC	No (NG)
Cadmium (Cd)	3	Ia	3500	I	14	SI	2090	SI	0.4	3	0.188	0.188	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Calcium (Ca)									8000	8000	4132	4132	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	NC	No
Chromium (Cr)	100	I b	20000	I b	220	SI c	6700	SI c	80	100	35.8	35.8	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Cobalt (Co)	50	G	300	G	50	G	300	G	30	50	11.1	11.1	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Copper (Cu)	15000	I	200000	I	1100	SI	20000	SI	45	1100	40.2	40.2	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Iron (Fe)									45,000	45,000	28,001	28,003	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	Yes	No
Lead (Pb)	400	I	4000	I	140	SI	8200	SI	60	140	58.0	58.0	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Lithium (Li)	1600	G	20000	G					-	1600	17.1	17.1	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	NC	No
Magnesium (Mg)									10,000	10,000	8114	8114	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	NC	No
Manganese (Mn)	1800	G	19000	G					800	1800	497	497	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Mercury (Hg)	15	I	2000	I	6.6	SI	690	SI	0.15	6.6	0.382	0.382	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	No	No
Molybdenum (Mo)	10	G	40	G	10	G	40	G	1'	10	0.882	0.882	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Nickel (Ni)	100	G	500	G	200	SI/DC	5100	DC	80	100	23.1	23.1	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Phosphorus (P)									2000	2000	864	864	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	NC	No
Potassium (K)									5000	5000	2388	2388	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	NC	No
Selenium (Se)	3	G	10	G	80	DC	4050	DC	4'	3	0.565	0.565	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Silver (Ag)	20	G	40	G	20	G	40	G	1'	20	0.140	0.140	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Sodium (Na)	>1,000,000	I	>1,000,000	I					900	1,000,000	658	658	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	Yes	No
Strontrium (Sr)	47000	G	100000	G					75	47,000	40.8	40.8	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Thallium (Tl)					1	SI, P	1	SI, P	-	1	0.135	0.135	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	NC	No
Tin (Sn)	50	G	300	G	50	G	300	G	4'	50	2.00	2.00	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Titanium (Ti)									2500	2500	1750	1750	McNab Creek Strata	No	NG	Yes	No
Uranium (U)	16	G	200	G	23	DC	510	DC	-	16	3.14	3.14	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	NC	No
Vanadium (V)	200	G	>1,000,000	I					150	200	73.5	73.5	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No
Zinc (Zn)	10000	I	>1,000,000	I					100	10,000	63.4	63.4	McNab Creek Strata	No	No	Yes	No

**Notes:**

Units in milligram per kilogram dry weight (mg/kg dw), unless otherwise noted.

CSR-Contaminated Sites Regulations Soil Standards-Schedules 4, 5 and 10 BC Regs 375/96, December 16, 1996, updates to January 2014.

CCME-Canadian Environmental Quality Guidelines - Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, 1999, includes updates to 2015.

BC Regional Background soil concentrations were obtained from BC MoE (2010) Protocol 4 - Determining Background Soil Quality, Table 1 - Regional background soil quality estimates for inorganic substances, Lower Mainland.

&gt; = greater than; DC = Direct contact; I = Soil Intake; G = Generic guideline or standard; NC = no background concentration available; mg/kg = milligram per kilogram; P = Provisional; SI = Soil ingestion pathway

a. Standard for land used to grow produce for human consumption

b. Standard is for Chromium VI

c. Standard is for total chromium

d. Non-toxic essential mineral

e. Lower of BC CSR and CCME. If a value was not available from BC CSR or CCME, BC regional background was used.

f. Background concentration based on half of the detection limit

Parameter	Input Value		Units	Source
	Adult	Toddler		
Body weight (BW)	70.7	16.5	kg	Health Canada 2010
Ingestion rate (fish)	0.04	0.02	kg/day	Health Canada 2007; eaters only sport/subsistence
Ingestion rate (shellfish)	0.009	-	kg/day	Health Canada 2007; eaters only intake
Oral RAF	1	1	unitless	Health Canada 2010; default assumption
Non-cancer TRV (oral RfD)	see Table 9.1-C-4	see Table 9.1-C-4	mg/kg BW/day	Health Canada 2010
Cancer TRV (oral slope factor)	see Table 9.1-C-4	see Table 9.1-C-4	(mg/kg BW/day) <sup>-1</sup>	Health Canada 2010
Target/acceptable hazard quotient	0.2	0.2	unitless	Health Canada 2010
Target/acceptable ILCR	1.00E-05	1.00E-05	unitless	Health Canada 2010
Life stage duration (for carcinogens)	60	N/A	years	Health Canada 2010
Life expectancy (for carcinogens)	80	N/A	years	Health Canada 2010
Days per year consuming fish/shellfish	365	365	days	Health Canada 2007

**Abbreviations:**

ILCR: incremental lifetime cancer risk; kg: kilogram; mg: milligram; RAF: relative absorption factor; RfD: reference dose; TRV: toxicity reference value

**References:**

Health Canada. 2010. Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada, Guidance on Human Health Preliminary Quantitative Risk Assessment (PQRA), Version 2.0.

Health Canada. 2007. Human Health Risk Assessment of Mercury in Fish and Health Benefits of Fish Consumption. Bureau of Chemical Safety Food Directorate Health Products and Food Branch. ON, Canada.

Parameter	Carcinogenic Classification	Non-Cancer TRV			Cancer TRV	
		Oral Reference Dose (RfD) mg/kg BW/day			Oral Slope Factor (SF) (mg/kg BW/day) <sup>1</sup>	
		Toddler	Adult	Source	Adult	Source
<b>Metals</b>						
Aluminum (Al)	NC	1.0	1.0	ATSDR 2008	-	-
Antimony (Sb)	NC	0.0004	0.0004	U.S. EPA 1987	-	-
Arsenic (As)	C	0.0003	0.0003	U.S. EPA 1991	1.8	Health Canada 2010
Barium (Ba)	NC	0.2	0.2	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Beryllium (Be)	NC	0.002	0.002	U.S. EPA 1998	-	-
Bismuth (Bi)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Boron (B)	NC	0.0175	0.0175	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Cadmium (Cd)	NC	0.001	0.001	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Calcium (Ca)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Cesium (Cs)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Chromium (Cr)	NC	0.001	0.001	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Chromium-VI (Cr-VI)	NC	0.003	0.003	U.S. EPA 1998	-	-
Cobalt (Co)	NC	0.0014	0.0014	RIVM 2001	-	-
Copper (Cu)	NC	0.091	0.141	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Gallium (Ga)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Iron (Fe)	NC	0.8	0.8	WHO 1983	-	-
Lead (Pb)	NC	0.0006	0.0013	SNC 2012, WHO 2011	-	-
Lithium (Li)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Magnesium (Mg)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Manganese (Mn)	NC	0.136	0.156	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Mercury (Hg)	NC	0.0002	0.0002	Health Canada 2010 <sup>[a]</sup>	-	-
Molybdenum (Mo)	NC	0.023	0.028	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Nickel (Ni)	NC	0.011	0.011	Health Canada 2010 <sup>[b]</sup>	-	-
Phosphorus (P)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Potassium (K)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Rhenium (Re)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Rubidium (Rb)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Selenium (Se)	NC	0.0062	0.0057	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Silver (Ag)	NC	0.005	0.005	U.S. EPA 1991	-	-
Sodium (Na)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Strontium (Sr)	NC	0.13	0.13	WHO 2010	-	-
Tellurium (Te)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Thallium (Tl)	NC	0.00061	0.00014	WHO 1996 <sup>[c]</sup>	-	-
Thorium (Th)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Tin (Sn)	NC	2	2	WHO 1982	-	-
Uranium (U)	NC	0.0006	0.0006	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Vanadium (V)	NC	0.00504	0.00504	U.S. EPA 1988 <sup>[d]</sup>	-	-
Yttrium (Y)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
Zinc (Zn)	NC	0.48	0.57	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Zirconium (Zr)	NC	-	-	-	-	-
<b>PAHs</b>						
Acenaphthene	NC	0.06	0.06	U.S. EPA 1990	-	-
Acenaphthylene	NC	0.06	0.06	U.S. EPA 1990 <sup>[e]</sup>	-	-
Anthracene	NC	0.3	0.3	U.S. EPA 1990	-	-
Benz(a)anthracene	C	-	-	-	0.23	Health Canada 2010
Benzo(a)pyrene	C	-	-	-	2.3	Health Canada 2010
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	C	-	-	-	0.23	Health Canada 2010
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	C	-	-	-	0.023	Health Canada 2010
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	C	-	-	-	0.23	Health Canada 2010
Chrysene	C	-	-	-	0.023	Health Canada 2010
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	C	-	-	-	2.3	Health Canada 2010
Fluoranthene	NC	0.04	0.04	U.S. EPA 1990	-	-
Fluorene	NC	0.04	0.04	U.S. EPA 1990 <sup>[f]</sup>	-	-
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	C	-	-	-	0.23	Health Canada 2010
2-Methylnaphthalene	NC	0.004	0.004	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Naphthalene	NC	0.02	0.02	Health Canada 2010	-	-
Phenanthrene	NC	0.04	0.04	RIVM 2001	-	-
Pyrene	NC	0.03	0.03	Health Canada 2010	-	-

**Abbreviations:**

BW: body weight; C: carcinogen; NC: non-carcinogen; mg: milligram; kg: kilogram; TRV: toxicity reference value

"-": value is not available

**Notes:**

[a] Values are for methylmercury. Value for women of child-bearing age and children &lt; 12 years.

[b] Value for soluble nickel

[c] The oral RfD for thallium is based on a urine concentration of 5 ug/L below which adverse human health effects are unlikely, which corresponds to a daily dose of less than 10 ug in the form of a soluble compound. The daily dose was adjusted by the age-specific body weight (16.5 kg for toddlers and 70.7 kg for adults) to derive the oral RfD.

[d] Derived from the oral RfD for vanadium pentoxide of 0.009 mg/kg-day based upon the proportion of the compound that is vanadium metal. Therefore, 0.009 mg/kg-day x 56% = 0.00504 mg/kg-day.

[e] A RfD is not available for acenaphthylene, therefore the value for acenaphthene was used as a surrogate.

[f] A RfD is not available for fluorene, therefore the value for fluoranthene was used as a surrogate.

**Sources:**ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). 2008. Minimal Risk Level for Aluminum. Available online at <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/mrls/mrlslist.asp#34tag>U.S. EPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency). Integrated Risk Information System. Online Database. Available online from [www.epa.gov/iris/](http://www.epa.gov/iris/). Accessed March 2, 2016. Assessment date is provided for each chemical.

Health Canada. 2010. Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada, Part II: Toxicological Reference Values (TRVs) and Chemical-Specific Factors. Version 2.0. Health Canada. Ottawa, ON.

RIVM (Rijksinstituut Voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu; National Institute of Public Health and the Environment). 2001. Re-evaluation of Human Toxicological Maximum Permissible Risk Levels. RIVM Report No. 711701 025. Bilthoven, Netherlands.

SNC Lavalin. 2012. Proposed Toxicological Reference Values for Lead (Pb). Prepared by Ross Wilson. May 29, 2012.

WHO (World Health Organization). 1982. Toxicological evaluation of certain food additives. WHO Food Additives Series, No. 17, no 552: Tin and Stannous Chloride

WHO. 1983. Toxicological evaluation of certain food additives. WHO Food Additives Series, No. 18, no 571: Iron

WHO. 1996. Environmental Health Criteria 182: Thallium. International Programme on Chemical Safety. Geneva.

WHO. 2010. CICAD (Concise International Chemical Assessment Document) 77: Strontium and Strontium Compounds.

WHO. 2011. WHO Food Additive Series: 64. Safety Evaluation of Certain Food Additives and Contaminants. Prepared by the seventy-third meeting of JECFA. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives. WHO Press, Geneva, Switzerland. ISBN 978 924 166064 8.



# ATTACHMENT 1

## Screened Baseline Soil and Tissue Concentrations



**Table 2: Baseline Fish Tissue Screening  
Public Health Assessment  
Proposed Burnco Aggregate Project**

Location Sample ID Date Sampled Matrix Units	Fish Screening Level <sup>1</sup>	Notes	McNab Creek
			ONCL 9-Dec-13 Tissue mg/kg wwt
<b>Physical Tests</b>			
% Moisture	-		76.2
<b>Metals</b>			
Aluminum (Al)	165		1.68
Antimony (Sb)	0.07		0.0047
Arsenic (As)	0.01		<b>0.381</b>
Barium (Ba)	33.0		0.058
Beryllium (Be)	0.33		<0.0020
Bismuth (Bi)	-		<0.0020
Boron (B)	2.89		<0.20
Cadmium (Cd)	0.17		0.0083
Calcium (Ca)	-		1260
Cesium (Cs)	-		0.0230
Chromium (Cr)	0.17	2	<b>0.259</b>
Chromium (Cr)	0.50	3	0.259
Cobalt (Co)	0.23		0.0112
Copper (Cu)	15.0		1.62
Gallium (Ga)	-		<0.0040
Iron (Fe)	132		15.0
Lead (Pb)	0.10		<b>2.35</b>
Lithium (Li)	-		<0.020
Magnesium (Mg)	-		364
Manganese (Mn)	22.4		0.335
Mercury (Hg)	0.03	4	<b>0.099</b>
Molybdenum (Mo)	3.80		0.0175
Nickel (Ni)	1.82	5	0.097
Phosphorus (P)	-		3190
Potassium (K)	-		3850
Rhenium (Re)	-		<0.0020
Rubidium (Rb)	-		1.53
Selenium (Se)	1.02		0.489
Silver (Ag)	0.83		0.0018
Sodium (Na)	-		509
Strontium (Sr)	21.5		4.62
Tellurium (Te)	-		<0.0040
Thallium (Tl)	0.10		0.00062
Thorium (Th)	-		<0.0020
Tin (Sn)	330		<0.020
Uranium (U)	0.10		<0.00040
Vanadium (V)	0.83		0.104
Yttrium (Y)	-		<0.0020
Zinc (Zn)	79.2		34.5
Zirconium (Zr)	-		<0.040

**Notes:**

- Screening values determined using Health Canada (2010) ingestion of contaminated foods equation. Details provided in text.
- Screening value for chromium VI; speciation data is not available, therefore, the total chromium concentration is compared to both the chromium VI and chromium III screening values.
- Screening value for chromium III; speciation data is not available, therefore, the total chromium concentration is compared to both the chromium VI and chromium III screening values.
- Screening value for methylmercury
- Screening value for soluble nickel

"-" = no value; < = below laboratory detection limit; mg/kg wwt = milligrams per kilogram in wet weight; ONCL= cutthroat trout.

Value	indicates exceedance of the screening level
-------	---

Value	indicates detection limit exceeds the screening level
-------	---







As a global, employee-owned organisation with over 50 years of experience, Golder Associates is driven by our purpose to engineer earth's development while preserving earth's integrity. We deliver solutions that help our clients achieve their sustainable development goals by providing a wide range of independent consulting, design and construction services in our specialist areas of earth, environment and energy.

For more information, visit [golder.com](http://golder.com)

Africa + 27 11 254 4800  
Asia + 86 21 6258 5522  
Australasia + 61 3 8862 3500  
Europe + 44 1628 851851  
North America + 1 800 275 3281  
South America + 56 2 2616 2000

[solutions@golder.com](mailto:solutions@golder.com)  
[www.golder.com](http://www.golder.com)

**Golder Associates Ltd.**  
**Suite 200 - 2920 Virtual Way**  
**Vancouver, BC, V5M 0C4**  
**Canada**  
**T: +1 (604) 296 4200**