Source Control Early Action Focused Feasibility Study

Introductory Presentation

Scott E. Thompson, PE Malcolm Pirnie, Inc.

Remedial Options Workgroup Meeting June 27, 2007





Overview of Presentations

- Introduction
- Geochemistry
- Risk Assessment
- Engineering
- Comparison of Alternatives





Introduction

- Presentation Overview
- Scope and Purpose of FFS
- Contents of FFS Document
- Synopsis of FFS





Geochemistry

- Conceptual Site Model
- Target Area Analysis
- Empirical Mass Balance Model
- Sediment Futurecast





Risk Assessment

- Human Health and Ecological
 - Evaluation of Current Risks
 - Estimation of Future Risks for Remedial Scenarios
 - Estimation of Risk Reduction
- Preliminary Remediation Goals
 - ARARs
 - Risk Based Concentrations
 - Site Background (Dundee Dam)
 - Selected PRGs





Engineering

- Alternative Development
 - Navigation
- Modeling (Cap Erosion & Flood)
- Concept Designs
- Geotechnical Evaluations
- Volume Estimates
- Dredged Material Management
- Cost Estimates





Comparisons Under EPA's Nine Criteria

- Volumes
- Flooding
- Costs
- Other
 - Adequacy and Reliability (LT Maintenance)
 - Permanence (Cap vs. Backfill)
 - Short Term Effectiveness





Description of Overall Project

- Comprehensive Study of the Lower Passaic River
 - Study Area includes 17-mile tidal portion of the river from Newark Bay to Dundee Dam (including tributaries) and watershed
 - Integrated CERCLA / WRDA project
 - Joint effort among USEPA, USACE, NJDOT, NOAA, USFWS, and NJDEP





Purpose of FFS

- CSM: Fine grained sediments of lower 8 miles identified as major source of contamination
- FFS undertaken to evaluate range of remedial alternatives that might be implemented as early action to control source
 - Final action for the sediments in the lower eight miles
 - Intended to take place in the near term, while comprehensive 17-mile study is on-going.





Contents of FFS Main Text

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Development of RAOs and Selection of Target Areas
- Identification and Screening of General Response Actions, Remedial Technology Classes, and Process Options
- Development of Remedial Alternatives
- Detailed Analysis of Remedial Alternatives





Contents of FFS Appendices

- Conceptual Site Model
- Sediment TBCs and PRGs
- Risk Assessment
- Empirical Mass Balance Model
- Engineering Memoranda
- Navigation Studies
- Cap Erosion and Flood Modeling
- Dredged Material Management Assessments
- Dredging Volume Estimates
- Cost Estimates





Synopsis

- High risk due to elevated surface concs.
- Neither No Action nor discrete remediation would achieve risk threshold within reasonable time frame
- Active alternatives achieve PRGs faster than No Action
 - Dioxin (65 percent of risk): 40 years faster
 - PCBs (33 percent of risk): 10 years faster
- Volume estimates range from 1.1M to 11M cy
- DMM relies on CDFs for disposal or storage
- Flooding impacts range from -17 to +93⁽¹⁾ acres
- Costs range from \$0.9B to \$2.3B

(1) Previously reported value of +24 acres has been corrected to +93 acres.



