0125.16 Corr.- FS

53638 A/

PRINCIPAL ISSUES

SDMS DocID 53638

1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MONEY

1a) >18 MONTHS TO GET TO DECISION POINT (DATA → MGT. MODEL → DECISION)

2) NOTHING TO RULE OUT TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY OF ANY ALTERNATIVE

⇒ VERY DIFFICULT TO ESTABLISH THAT IN-HARBOR DISPOSAL IS THE ONLY PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVE.

2a) INDIANA HARBOR → DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (TECHNOLOGY ASS'T, NOT FS/SUPERFUND

3) MAY NOT BE A NEED TO REMOVE SEDIMENTS UNDER EMBANKMENT

⇒ NO TEMPORARY ~~[illegible]~~ STORAGE & COST SAVINGS

3a) CAD (CONFINED AQUATIC DISPOSAL) PART OF INDIANA HARBOR DEMONSTRATION. (MORE AN EQUIPMENT DEMONSTRATION)

4) STABILIZATION MUST BE CONSIDERED AS TECHNICALLY FEASIBLE.

a) IN-SITU (CEMENT, SILICA) (EPA REPORTS, JAP LIT)

b) TO FIX SEDIMENTS IN SUBSURFACE CELLS

c) " " " " CONTAINMENT SITE (TOP VS. BOTTOM VS. THROUGHOUT VS. UNDERLYING MATERIALS)

4a) CDF (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY) BEING USED BY NCD (CHICAGO), BUT MOSTLY CLEAN

5) OILY FILM RELEASE MAY NOT EVEN BE A DREDGING ISSUE.

6) ROTTERDAM HARBOR: NASTIEST IS THE WORLD. SUCCESSFULLY USED CAD.

6a) WEIR AT BRIDGE A WASTE OF MONEY - WON'T BE EFFECTIVE.

7a) MGT STRATEGY (18 MOS. THROUGH DESIGN)

7) SILT CURTAINS ARE NOT EFFECTIVE - MORE FOR CR PURPOSES.

7a) JRB STUDY: FOR SPILL CLEAN-UP (UPDATE OF COE 1978 MANUAL)

8) PACKAGE TREATMENT PLANT NOT APPROPRIATE. TECHNOLOGIES ARE AVAILABLE, HOWEVER. MORE TESTING NECESSARY.

9) WE DEVELOP TECHNOLOGIES - JAPANESE & DUTCH ARE FIRST TO IMPLEMENT IT.

9) NOTEWORTHY: 1-YEAR DEWATERING PERIOD REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE STABILITY FOR FINAL CLOSURE.

10) TOO EARLY TO TELL IF LINER IS NEEDED. LEACHATE PROTOCOL UNDER DEVELOPMENT

11) REMOVE HOTTEST SPOTS DIFFERENTLY - DON'T DREDGE.

COE MAY REFUSE FUNDS. TA MONEY VS. OBLIGATED FUNDS.

THE ONLY WAY THAT OUR STUDY IS WORTH ANYTHING WOULD BE IF WE CAN ISSUE A ROD THAT ESTABLISHES THAT "DREDGING" IS THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE!

ELUTRIATE TEST

DREDGING

OILY FILMS

DISPOSAL

TREATMENT

CORPS TESTING OF SEDIMENTS

CAN COE PROVIDE CRITERIA FOR DESIGN, OR MUST A/E

FAST-TRACK VS. OVERALL

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MONEY?

WHAT WE NEED TO ESTABLISH FEASIBILITY:

1) NOTHING TO RULE OUT TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY OF ANY ALTERNATIVE ⇒ VERY DIFFICULT TO SATISFY WETLANDS FOLKS.

☆ GET DATA/REPORTS TO COE

I. SITE EVALUATION

A. ~~[illegible]~~ SITE TO BE DREDGED

1. GRAB SAMPLES: ATTERBERG LIMITS, GRAIN SIZE, DENSITY, IN-SITU WATER CONT (ENGINEERING CLASSIFICATION)
2. DEPTH OF CONTAMINANTS

B. DISPOSAL SITE

1. NO NEED FOR REMOVAL OF CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS UNDER EMBANKMENT ⇒ NO TEMPORARY STORAGE & COST SAVINGS.
2. ENGINEERING PROPERTIES

II. SELECTION OF DREDGING EQUIPMENT

A. CONVENTIONAL CUTTERHEAD DREDGE (NOT BUCKETWHEEL)

1. PRODUCTION SUFFICIENT, CLEANEST WITH PROPER CONTROL
2. JAPANESE MAY BE CLEANER, BUT PRODUCTION NOT SUFFICIENT (MANY LOGISTICAL/PROCEDURAL DIFFICULTIES) CORPS WILL CHECK IF FURTHER
3. 8-HOUR SHIFT!

WDT/JL

B. WHAT IS RECIRCULATION? WHY NEEDED?

C. WHY BUCKETWHEEL?

(MODIFIED)

III. STANDARD ELUTRIATE TEST = GOOD INDICATOR OF RELEASE.

A. "OILY FILM" RELEASE NOT NECESSARILY APPLICABLE

B. WOULDN'T CONCLUDE THAT OILY FILM WILL BE RELEASED ⇒ WE MAY BE SHOOTING OURSELVES IN THE FOOT.

C. 10's mg/l TSS NEAR THE DREDGE. HOW DO THIS COMPARE TO AMBIENT?

D. VOLATILIZATION

IV. WEIRS & SILT CURTAINS

A. SILT CURTAINS NOT VERY EFFECTIVE. PUBLIC RELATIONS OK

B. WOULD FORCE TURBIDITY DOWNWARD – BUT ONLY UNDER QUIESCENT CONDITIONS (@ 1 fps)

C. WEIR AT BRIDGE NOT EFFECTIVE AT ALL.

V. PRIMARY CONTAINMENT SITE.

A. WE ARE REALLY CREATING AN UPLAND SITE.

OK 1. MODIFIED ELUTRIATE TEST (FAST)

WES 2. SURFACE RUNOFF TEST (1 MONTH)

R&D 3. LEACHATE TEST (LONGER) (CONSOLIDATION TESTING NEEDED)

a. OILY WOULD BE PRIMARY RELEASE MECHANISM

4. INDIANA HARBOR CASE: MAY GIVE US SOME INSIGHT (SEE RESULTS)

B. ENGINEERING TESTS (DREDGING VS. DISPOSAL)

1. MUST BE DESIGNED AS AN EFFECTIVE SETTLING BASIN

OK 2. SETTLING TESTS (AS PER COE PROTOCOLS) TO DETERMINE DREDGING & TREATMENT RATIO

3. 10's mg/l RELEASED OVER WEIR (VS 100's g/l GOING IN)

4. DREDGING – DEWATERING – TREATMENT LOADINGS MUST COINCIDE

5. CHEMICAL ADDITION MAY BE GOOD TO ENHANCE SETTLING – NOT AS EFFECTIVE FOR SALT WATER, HOWEVER.

6. PCB LIMITS MAY BE EXCEEDED (SETTLING & MOD. ELUTRIATE TESTS WILL TELL YOU).

7. FLOCCULANT NOT NEEDED IF 2-CELL APPROACH USED @ CHEM. ADDITION

NUS

DAN THREFALL	REGION I COORDINATOR
RON BURS	CHEMISTRY/LAB
JOE YEASTED	NEW BEDFORD
GARY SMITH	HEALTH & SAFETY, AIR MONI.
GEORGE GARDNER	CHARLES GEORGE, REG. I ACTIVITIES
GARY BESWICK	HEALTH & SAFETY, AIR MONI.