



Park West Two  
Cliff Mine Road  
Pittsburgh, PA 15275  
412-788-1080  
C-34-12-3-14

NEW BEDFORD  
4.1  
96613

December 1, 1983

Project No. 0725.06

Mr. Gerry Sotolongo  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region I  
John F. Kennedy Federal Building  
Boston, Massachusetts 02203

Dear Gerry:

NUS has recently completed the "critical flaw" analysis of potential sites for the disposal of contaminated dredge material from New Bedford Harbor. This analysis was based on the screening criteria agreed to at the recent Task Force meeting. A total of 56 sites remained as candidates within a 10-mile driving distance from New Bedford, including 44 upland sites and 12 harbor sites. These sites represent a combination of sites identified in previously completed studies within the New Bedford area, and new sites delineated by NUS' New Bedford staff.

We are now proceeding with the assignment of "scores" for each site toward the objective of an initial quantitative screening. In addition, a field reconnaissance of the sites will be conducted during the week of December 5 to further support this screening. We expect that only about 10 upland and 3 harbor sites will remain in consideration upon completion of the initial quantitative screening. Color-coded maps are also being prepared to demonstrate the findings of the "critical flaw" analysis, and should prove useful for any necessary presentations and future reports.

Attached is a list of the ranking factors being used for the initial quantitative screening of upland sites. The procedure will be to assign a numerical "score" between 1 and 10 for each of the sub-factors at a given site, compute an average score for the major categories, and then compute an overall site score by multiplying the category scores by a weighting factor and summing over all categories. Your input is sought for the assignment of weighting factors to the various categories, as well as any general comments about the ranking factors.

Mr. Gerry Sotolongo  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
December 1, 1983 - Page Two

Because we have found that the ranking factors are not conducive to a direct quantitative comparison between upland and harbor sites, we have decided to screen the harbor sites separately. This screening will focus primarily on storage capacity and distance from the hot-spots (due to pumping costs), although any peculiar environmental, public health, or other features at a given site will be considered.

The fast-track Feasibility Study is also proceeding toward completion of an initial screening of alternatives. I will be talking to you about this in anticipation of setting up a Task Force meeting the week of December 19 to discuss the NUS findings and recommendations.

Sincerely,



J. G. Yeasted, P.E., Ph.D.  
Project Manager

JGY/lcw  
Enclosure

## UPLAND SITE RANKING FACTORS

### SITE-SPECIFIC FACTORS

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>SUB-FACTORS</u>
Current Land Use*	Prime agricultural lands (F)** Buffer zones (F)
Surface Conditions	Ground slope (M) Existing cover (F) Site drainage (M,F) Receiving stream (M,F) Storage available (M)
Subsurface Conditions	Surface soils (R,F) Depth to bedrock (R) Depth to groundwater (R) Existence of clay/till strata (R)

### REGIONAL FACTORS

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>SUB-FACTORS</u>
Transport distance	---(M)
Route Conditions	Road grade (M) Weight/bridge restrictions (F) Type of road surface (F) Availability of access road (M,F)
Environmental Acceptability	Visual impacts (F) Air quality (F) Water quality (F) Noise (F) Habitat/Ecology (F) Cultural Resources (R)
Public Health	Development along route (M,F) Development around site (M,F)

\* Developed areas were previously eliminated in "critical flaw" analysis. Other sub-factors, such as zoning restrictions and property ownership, will not be considered until the next phase of detailed quantitative screening.

\*\* Sources of information to assign ranking values:

F=field reconnaissance

M=available maps

R=available reports