

EBASCO

4.6.9



SDMS DocID 46233

April 23, 1992
ARCS I 92-139
No Response Required

Ms. Gayle Garman
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Waste Management Division
J.F.K. Federal Building (HPS-CAN2)
Boston, MA 02203-2211

Superfund Records Center
SITE: New Bedford
BREAK: 0801
OTHER: 46233

Subject: ARCS I - EPA CONTRACT NO. 68-W9-0034
WORK ASSIGNMENT NO. 12-1L43
NEW BEDFORD HARBOR - POST FS SUPPORT
TASK 15 SUPPLEMENTAL SFS COST ESTIMATE

Dear Ms. Garman:

Attached please find Ebasco's preliminary evaluation of potential costs associated with remediating (dredging except capping at the Outfall) the nine potentially PCB contaminated sediment areas identified in Appendix E of the SFS. It should be noted that this preliminary cost estimate does not incorporate all of the detailed evaluation included in the cost estimates presented in the SFS. Therefore, caution should be exercised in using this preliminary estimate.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (617) 451-1201.

Very truly yours,
Lewis Horzempa
Lewis Horzempa
Project Manager

LH/mec
Attachment

cc: N. Barmakian (letter only)
L. Sejido
A. Fowler

FILE: ARCS PM 1.1

EBASCO

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

DATE: April 23, 1992
DOC. #: M92-135
TO: Lew Horzempa
FROM: Alan Fowler *asf*
SUBJECT: NEW BEDFORD HARBOR RI/FS
TASK 15 SUPPLEMENTAL FEASIBILITY STUDY (SFS)
COST IMPLICATIONS ON ALTERNATIVE BAY-4
IF REMEDIAL VOLUMES INCREASE

This evaluation includes an order of magnitude estimate of the potential costs under Alternative BAY-4 of the Draft SFS if the remedial volumes increased. As a basis for evaluating the potential up-side cost limit for Alternative BAY-4, the areas and associated remedial volumes for Upper Buzzards Bay were increased. For the capping component at the City of New Bedford's Outfall, the area was expanded to 89 acres from the estimated 17 acres in the SFS. The 89 acres represents the estimated area using all of the available PCB sediment data over the last 15 years (Figure 1). This requires a total of over 850,000 yd³ of sediment for capping material based on an equivalent cap thickness of 6 feet throughout the area. The equivalent cap thickness is the amount of material that would have to be placed to ensure a minimum cap thickness of two feet.

The dredging area was expanded from the 42 acres presented in the SFS, to approximately 113 acres. This area represents 70 percent of the areas of potential dredging presented in Figure 1. As shown in the figure, potential dredging areas do not include the Outfall. Based on a dredging depth of one foot, the associated increase in volume for the 113 acres is approximately 185,000 yd³, or a new total of 252,000 yd³. Disposal of this material can be accommodated by increasing the height of CDFs 1, 1A and 3 by four feet.

The costs for the Alternative BAY-4 were not formally estimated. However, an order of magnitude estimate for the expanded alternative is on the order of \$30 to \$40 million. To conduct a formal cost estimate, costs to upgrade the three CDFs and to transport dredge material to the Estuary from Apponagansett Bay and Clarks Cove would have to be developed. As with Alternative BAY-4 presented in the SFS, there may be significant cost savings

Lew Horzempa
April 23, 1992
Page 2

associated with the use of marine material for capping at the Outfall area. These savings may be on the order of \$10 million. However, obtaining nearly a million cubic yards of clean marine material for capping may be difficult due to logistical and regulatory constraints.

ASF/dlm

FILE: ARCS PM 1.3
NBH

