RETURN TO 1998 ROD AR INDEX

13.4.44

Summary of Meeting Held May 21, 1997
of the New Bedford Harbor Superfund Forum

Superfund Records Center
SITE: NEW BEDFORD
BREAK: 13.04
OTHER: 47604

In attendance at the session were:

James Brown, EPA
Steve Cassidy, HARC
Cindy Catri, EPA
Frank Ciavattieri, EPA
Paul Craffey, DEP
David Dickerson, EPA
Molly Fontaine, City of New Bedford
Joe Forns, AMEL
John Halland, Town of Fairhaven
David Janik, MA Coastal Zone Mgmt.
Claudia Kirk, Concerned Parents of Fairhaven
Harley Laing, EPA
Kathleen Rocha, Concerned Parents of Fairhaven
Carol Sanz, Downwind Coalition
Jim Simmons, HARC
Bill Straus, State Representative
Helen Waldorf, DEP

Jim Simmons made a presentation to the Forum on the dredging activities undertaken by the Department of Marine Fisheries on behalf of the New Bedford Harbor Trustee Council as part of the Restoration Project. The Forum members expressed concern that information about the dredging project had not been made available to the community so they would understand the purpose. Concern was also voiced about whether the dredging would disturb the contaminated area in such a way as to create risk.

Project staff for EPA and DEP acknowledged a lack of coordination with the Trustee Council and reported a scheduled meeting for the purpose of setting up a more effective working relationship. They also reported that the Office of Marine Fisheries had been very cooperative when requested to cease the dredging operation.

Alan Fowler presented the Ecologic Final Report and updates on Foster-Wheeler's plan for preparing a draft feasibilty report including cost estimates. (see attachment)

EPA reported that they will still expect to complete responses to comments on ROD II and have it available by ~~late August~~. said "Fall" DJD 6/12/97

The Facilitator offered suggestions regarding membership of the Forum, especially the need to identify members representing the community most affected by site activities. It

SDMS DocID 47604

compared with the per ton treatment costs.

Vendor cost estimate totals for full scale Hot Spot treatment were $13 million for Ionics RCC (solvent extraction), $9.7 million for Geosafe, and $9.3 million for SAIC/EcoLogic. It was noted that Foster Wheeler will calculate their own cost estimates for full scale treatment using the different technologies and expects that the costs will be similar to the vendor estimates with the exception of Geosafe, which is likely to cost significantly more, once all of the materials staging and dewatering considerations are factored into the equation.

Feasibility Study Addendum/Treatability Study report - The Feasibility Study Addendum/Treatability Study report is currently being prepared by Foster Wheeler and is expected to be completed in draft form by the end of August. An initial list of remedial alternatives includes in-place capping, solvent extraction and chemical destruction (both solid phase and gas phase destruction), staged vitrification, thermal separation and chemical destruction, and off-site disposal alternatives.

Report to New Bedford Forum May 21, 1997

Alan Fowler of Foster Wheeler Environmental provided an update of the on-going treatability study efforts. The presentation focused on four topics including.

Overall project status
SAIC/EcoLogic vendor report results
Vendor cost estimates for full scale treatment
Feasibility Study Addendum/Treatability Study report

Overall project status - The field testing and reporting phases for the three treatability study vendors is now complete. The three vendors and associated treatment approaches included: 1) Ionics RCC and CRTI testing a combination of solvent extraction and chemical dechlorination, 2) Geosafe testing staged vitrification, and 3) SAIC/Eco Logic testing a combination of thermal desorption and chemical destruction. Foster Wheeler is currently preparing the Feasibility Study Addendum/Treatability Study report which will incorporate the results of these treatability tests in evaluating alternatives to incineration for treatment of the Hot Spot sediments.

SAIC/EcoLogic vendor report results - The SAIC/Eco Logic process consists of a two step process involving:
1) the thermal desorption of organic contaminants from the Hot Spot sediments and 2) the Gas Phase chemical destruction of those contaminants followed by an off-gas treatment system. The pilot scale testing was conducted in November/December 1996 and was generally successful at removing PCBs from the Hot Spot sediment. PCB concentrations were reduced from 5,700 ppm to 52 ppm in the sediment and the treated sediment passed the TCLP leaching test

The SAIC/Eco Logic thermal desorption unit did experience some materials handling difficulties during the thermal desorption step. These included a sediment throughput of approximately 40 % of the design capacity, initial difficulties reaching design temperature, particulate loss within the thermal desorption unit, and a loss of molten tin during operations. Other difficulties included mis-operation of the feed sediment delivery system and a mechanical breakdown of the solids exit system.

The SAIC/Eco Logic Reactor system was also successful, with a Destruction Removal Efficiency (DRE) of 99.9999% for PCBs, and 99.9996%, for dioxin/furan compounds. Off-gas treatment following the reactor would be required to meet applicable air standards for particulates, acids, heavy metals, and residual organics. SAIC/Eco Logic estimates that it would take six to 12 months to design and fabricate a treatment unit of this type and approximately 12 months to treat Hot Spot sediment.

In addition to using the reactor system to treat a thermal desorption gas phase, the SAIC/Eco Logic reactor system could be applicable to treating the oily/waxy PCB laden residuals produced by a solvent extraction process (such as the Ionics RCC process). This potential option will be further evaluated by Foster Wheeler in the upcoming Feasibility Study Addendum/Treatability Study report.

Vendor cost estimates for full scale treatment - Vendor costs estimates were based on treating 19,000 tons of Hot Spot sediment (15,000 cubic yards). Costs not directly associated with the treatment technology, such as removing sediment from the CDF and backfilling treated solids were not included in the estimates. Stabilization of treated sediments were not included in treatment costs as treated solids from each of the three processes passed TCLP leaching tests. Costs were broken down into capital equipment, mobilization/demobilization, and into the different phases of treatment (i.e., chemical separation phase and chemical destruction), where applicable. It was noted that the cleanup is a relatively small one, accordingly, the capital equipment costs, mobilization and demobilization costs are relatively high when

JUN. 4. 1997 10:07AM US EPA REG. ADMIN NO. 0057 P. 2

was also observed that the work of the Forum on the implementation of the Phase I agreement is still ongoing until a new remedy is chosen.

The next meeting was scheduled for July 30th at New Bedford Regional Vocational School Auditorium at 6:00 p.m.

The main agenda will be to prepare for review of the Draft Feasibility Report on Treatability Studies expected by end of August.