# **Kalamazoo River Superfund Project**





ALLEGAN, KALAMAZOO AND CALHOUN COUNTY MAPPING OM MICHIGAN RESCURCE INFORMATION SYSTEM

 OU4: 12th Street Landfill OU5: Kalamazoo River and Portage Creek







# **Conceptual Site Model**



#### The primary exposure pathways at OU1 are associated with the following:

- Consumption of fish.
- Direct contact with residuals. \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_ residuals.
- Ingestion of or direct contact with groundwater.

- Colloidal transport in groundwater.
- Surface water runoff.
- Wind dispersion of exposed residuals. \_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_



Inhalation of dust and volatile emissions from floodplain soils and consolidated

**Transport mechanisms that may result in completed exposure pathways include:** 

Erosion of contaminated materials to Portage Creek and Kalamazoo River System.

## PCB Detections in Groundwater at Allied Landfill



- 357 groundwater samples collected from 1993 through 2003.
- 2002 and 2003 sampling event best represents current conditions after TCRA was performed.
  - 57 groundwater locations were sampled for PCBs in 2002/2003.
  - 10 of the 57 locations had PCB detections.
  - 3 of the 10 locations had PCB concentrations above GSI criteria. The
    3 exceedances of GSI groundwater criteria occurred in wells screened
    within or immediately adjacent to the residuals.
- No current evidence of PCBs in groundwater and/or impacts to Portage Creek and fish in Portage Creek.

# **PCB Distribution in Subsurface**





ES122013120057GNV Allied\_OU-1\_Wells\_CSM\_rev3.ai 1/30/2014 DCD

Former Bryant Mill Pond

-600 -2 -0.2 -0.1 -0.04

**Commercial Properties** Sub-Area

Former Type III Landfill Sub-Area

2,000 <u>-</u>

TREATMEN

BUILDING



MW-121B Bryant HRDL/FRDLs Sub-Area

MW-125B

N

MLSS-

10-0.07-







Soil Borings with PCB Concentrations Greater than 50 ppm Allied Paper OU-1 Kalamazoo River Superfund Site Kalamazoo, Michigan



## Nature of PCBs in the Environment

#### PCBs do not dissolve readily and typically stay bonded to particulates.

- PCBs bind strongly to organic material.
- Residuals are grey clay and fibrous wood material, high in organics content.
- 65 of the 66 soil or sediment samples with PCB concentrations >10 mg/kg contained residuals.

#### PCB mobility also affected by soil density, particle size distribution, moisture content, and soil permeability.

- PCBs attached to small mobile particulates (colloids) may travel in groundwater.
- Residuals at Allied Landfill similar to clays and allow little water flow through them.

Bound to **Organic Material** (immobile)



## Remedial Action Objectives (RAO)

RAOs are goals for protecting human health and the environment.

**RAO 1** – Mitigate the potential for human and ecological

exposure to materials at OU1 containing COC concentrations that exceed applicable risk-based cleanup criteria.

**RAO 2** – Mitigate the potential for COC-containing materials to migrate, by erosion or surface water runoff, into Portage Creek or onto adjacent properties.

**RAO 3** – Prevent contaminated waste material at the OU1 landfill from impacting groundwater and

#### surface water.

### NCP Criteria

In evaluating the cleanup alternatives at all Superfund sites, EPA uses a specific set of nine criteria (called the NCP Criteria) that ask the following questions about each alternative:

#### **Threshold Criteria** – must be met for an alternative to be eligible.

- **1. Overall protection of human health and the environment.** Is it protective? How are risks eliminated, reduced, or controlled?
- 2. Compliance with ARARs. Does it meet environmental laws or provide grounds for a waiver?

#### **Balancing Criteria** – determines relative strengths and weaknesses among the criteria that meet threshold.

- 3. Long-term effectiveness and permanence. Does it provide reliable protection over time?
- 4. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment. Does it use a treatment technology? This is preferred, if possible.
- 5. Short-term effectiveness. Will the remedy be implemented fast enough to address short-term risks, and will there be adverse effects (human health or environmental) during construction/implementation?
- **6.** Implementability. How difficult will it be to implement (e.g. availability of materials or coordination of Federal, State, and local agencies)?
- 7. Cost effectiveness. What are the estimated capital and operation and maintenance costs in comparison to other, equally-protective alternatives?

- **Modifying Criteria** implemented once all public comments are evaluated. They may prompt modifications to the preferred alternative to achieve the end result of a preferred alternative for cleanup in which EPA and the community can be confident.
- **State acceptance.** Does the State agree with, oppose, or have no comment on it? 8.
- 9. Community acceptance. Does the community support, have reservations about, or oppose it?

# The Superfund Process

• Remedial Investigation determines the nature and extent of contamination at the site.

 Feasibility Study identifies technologies capable of treating the contamination, and evaluates the cost and performance of alternatives that could be used to clean up the site.

• EPA releases Proposed Plan identifying the preferred alternative for the site.

• EPA issues a Public Notice.

• Public Comment period on the Proposed Plan.

• Explains which cleanup alternative was selected for the site.

Contains Responsiveness Summary to public comments on the Proposed Plan.

#### Record of Decision

Remedial

Design

Ranking

**RI/FS** 

Proposed

Plan

• Engineering evaluations performed to design a safe and protective remedy.

• Plans and specifications are developed for construction.

• Prioritization Panel reviews and compares all of the Superfund projects that are construction ready (i.e., have designs completed) and require Federal funding.

• Process is used to distribute Superfund funding to start or continue construction at selected sites.

• Construction of the alternative selected in the ROD.

• Length of the remedial action can be affected by the amount of funding available each year.

Remedial



### Alternative 1 – No Further Action



- Evaluation of this alternative is required under the National Contingency Plan.
  - Not protective of human health and environment. Does not achieve RAOs.
  - Does not comply with ARARs.
- No removal or consolidation of wastes.
- No maintenance of existing cap.
- Cost: \$120,000.

# Alternative 2 – Options Consolidation & Engineered Cap

#### **Alternative 2A**

- Excavate soils above cleanup criteria outside future cap limits and place under two engineered caps, one on Monarch and one on the Former Operations Areas.
- Estimated 39,000 truckloads.
- Includes longterm groundwater monitoring network.



- Construction Duration: 2 years.
- Cost: \$43 Million.



#### Alternative 2B

- Excavate soil above cleanup criteria outside future cap limits and place under an engineered cap.
- Material from Monarch is moved to Former Operations Area.
- Smaller capped area for maintenance and restricted use.
- Estimated 49,000 truckloads.
- Includes long-term groundwater monitoring network.
- Construction Duration: 2 years.
- Cost: \$41 million.

#### Alternative 2C

- Alternative 2B plus offsite incineration of 15,000 cubic yards with PCBs >500 ppm.
- Increased risk due to offsite transport for incineration.
- Estimated 50,000 truckloads.
- Construction Duration: 2 years.
- Cost: \$62 million.

## Alternative 3 – Offsite Disposal



- Excavate 1.6 million cubic yards of waste material and soil above site cleanup criteria.
- Offsite transportation and disposal.
- Backfill the excavation to above the water table.
- Estimated 150,000 truck trips or an average of 115 trucks per day.
- Construction Duration: 5 years.
- Cost: \$189 million.

# Alternative 4 – Construction of Fully Encapsulating Landfill



- Excavate 1.6 million cubic yards of soil above clean up criteria.
- Import 800,000 cubic yards of clean soil to raise bottom elevation above water table and

#### construct bottom liner.

- 1.1 million cubic yards placed in landfill constructed onsite and 500,000 cubic yards of materials offsite for disposal due to limited capacity.
- Estimated 116,000 truck trips or an average of 90 trucks per day.
- Includes long-term groundwater monitoring network.
- Construction Duration: 10 years.
- Cost: \$136 million.

### Landfill Cap Construction Details



ALTERNATIVE 2A, B & C CONTAINMENT SYSTEM CAP LINER SECTION FIGURE 4-2C

ALLIED PAPER, INC. / PORTAGE CREEK / KALAMAZOO RIVER SUPERFUND SITE ALLIED PAPER, INC. OU

#### **CH2M**HILL





ALLIED PAPER, INC. / PORTAGE CREEK / KALAMAZOO RIVER SUPERFUND SITE ALLIED PAPER, INC. OU



# Key Feasibility Study Assumptions

- Clean up criteria will be dependant on land use and vary throughout the site.
  - Residential Soil Criteria: 1 mg/kg
  - Non-Residential Soil Criteria: 10 mg/kg
  - Sediment Criteria: 0.33 mg/kg
  - Visually identified residuals will be removed and followed by analytical testing to determine extents.
  - Actual criteria will be established in the Record of Decision.
- Design investigation is required to refine quantities and extents of contamination.
- Sources for imported soils are assumed to be within 40 miles of the site.
- Disposal facilities are assumed as follows:
  - <40 miles for soils <50 mg/kg (Alternatives 3 and 4)
  - 150 miles for soils >50 mg/kg (Alternative 3)
  - 1,200 miles for soils >500 mg/kg (Alternative 2C)
- Construction is assumed to be limited to Monday through Friday, from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm.
- Construction is generally expected to be performed between the months of April and November.