

MEMO/FAX

To: Hudson River File

From: John Szeligowski

Subject: Phone Conversation Notes (3/26/01)
Sam Borees USEPA Region V
Fox River and Pine River

Project: Hudson River FS

Date: March 29, 2001

This memo is a summary of conference call among the following participants:

Sam Borees - USEPA Region V
Doug Tomchuk - USEPA Region 2
Alison Hess - USEPA Region 2
Tariq Ahmed - TAMS
Ed Garvey - TAMS
Jennifer Higgins - TAMS
John Szeligowski - TAMS

The purpose of the call was specifically to discuss experiences that Region V has had with odor at the Fox River and Pine River sites.

Fox River

The Fox river work has been accomplished using hydraulic dredges. Material is precessed on-site through various dewatering systems including plate and frame filters. There was no noticeable off-site odor during previous Fox river work. The nearest receptor to the processing site is a residence about 100 feet across the street from the dewatering area. On-site there was a musty odor from materials storage piles.

There is a swage discharge about 3 miles upstream of the dredging area and also a paper plant outfall in the immediate area. TAMS requested that SB provide information on conventional pollution parameters for the Fox River sediments. Sam said he would look for such information and send it to Region 2.

Pine River

This project involved clean up of discharges from a chemical facility. There were two phases to the work. One phase was to be critical; and the second phase was remedial in nature. The

contaminants of concern include DDT (40,000 ppm), bromated biphenols (30-40,000 ppm), chloro-benzene (10-20,000 ppm), and pockets with 1% oil product, among others.

The time critical work was accomplished in 0.5 acre sheet pile cells that were dewatered (total area of 2.5 acres?). During the work odor was noticed from sediments showing the impact of historic sewage discharges and there was a sweet solvent odor from chloro-benzene contaminated sediment. Also, a peat layer underlies the site and this gave off his gave off a swamp-like vegetation decomposition odor.

In this location one neighbor definitely had odor problems. The work was performed as quickly as possible and an attempt was made to limit the exposed work area. Under some circumstances (wind direction in particular) work was suspended because of odor. Lime was spread over the contaminated sediments with a track hoe. The sediment and lime were mixed in-situ to avoid a Davis Bacon problem. The removal was conducted with long reach boom (70' stick and boom combination that supported a small bucket).

When the work reached DDT contaminated areas they encountered serious odor problems and wind direction became important. Odors were noticed up to 1/4 mile from site. About 30,000 cubic yards of sediment were removed.

The remedial phase of work involved about 13 acres of contaminated sediments which were remediated in approximately 3 acre work zones. There was a noticeable sweet smell during this phase. Also, the contractor used a beet derived stabilization agent (post sugar extraction) but this also gave off some odor. However, not too many complaints were received from this work. Also, sometime in the past there were sewage discharges in this area as well.

SB mentioned that where wetland soils are being removed, these mucky soils will be a source of some local odor from the decay of vegetation.

Fox River

Work at the Fox river was routinely accomplished in Level D clothing. However, where workers need to enter tanks that were part of the treatment system, they wore Level B protection. PCB levels in the sediment being processed were 5 to 40 ppm.

Pine River

Workers were in Level C at sometimes and when odors were very strong, work stopped. Real time air monitoring was conducted. On a daily basis. Used PUF tubes and data RAMS as samplers. Lime dust was also a concern (acid attack).

Manistique

This site handled contaminated sediments with as much as 22,000 ppm (PCB?). This year average levels (PCBs) were 600 ppm. No enclosures were used for the work and the program

was conducted in Level D clothing. EPA does not expect to detect PCBs a few hundred feet from the work area. Suggest that protection start at a relatively high and then be down graded.

Kalamazoo River

About 40 miles of river need to be remediated. This is a PCB site. Allied Paper was the PRP.
Pine River

There were noise and lighting complaints at this site. The contractor constructed a fence for noise abatement. With regard to lights the contractor had to adjust the lighting systems he was employing. Pine river did not have a major noise problem because of site geography.

Fox River

Hospital mufflers were employed at this site to control noise. At this site EPA is considering either mechanical or hydraulic . SB stated getting a tight seal with the clamshell can be a problem.