

## **NOAA Suggested Charge Questions for the Peer Review Panel**

1. Are the performance standards implementable?
2. Does the near- and far-field station sampling approach developed as part of the resuspension standard provide time-relevant and useful information or should the sampling be redesigned?
3. Were the assumptions made in developing the resuspension standards appropriate and reasonable? For example, two of the assumptions that went into the development of the standard are that the dissolved PCB fraction likely to be released from dredging is small relative to baseline conditions and that the total PCBs load should not exceed 650 kg over the course of the project. Data documents high concentrations of PCBs in surface sediments and an elevated ambient flux of PCBs to the water column during the dredging season.
4. Are the 3 engineering performance standards developed sufficient for the dredging component of the remedy? If not, what other standards should be developed? Should standards also be developed for backfilling/capping and MNA?
5. Are the residual performance standards consistent with the remedy? Is it possible that the residuals allowable by the standards could decrease the effectiveness of the remedy set forth in the ROD?
6. What constitutes an appropriately designed sub-aqueous cap given the hydrodynamics of the river, the projected recovery trajectory of the remedy, and the consequences of cap failure on the other remedial components and the remedial action objectives?
7. How susceptible would backfill and sub-aqueous caps be to redistribution/erosion/scour in the post-construction condition of the river? What types of backfill/caps would provide the greatest permanence for the residual levels allowable under the Residual Standard and still provide quality habitat?