



FEASIBILITY STUDY AT THE ABANDONED DEACTIVATION FURNACE (SEAD-16) AND THE ACTIVE DEACTIVATION FURNACE (SEAD-17)

NOVEMBER 1997

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Purpose and Organization of Report
- 1.1.1 Operable Units
- 1.2 Site Background
- 1.2.1 Site Description
- 1.2.1.1 Geologic Setting
- 1.2.2 Site History
- 1.2.2.1 Previous Investigations
- 1.3 Nature and Extent of Constituents of Concern
- 1.4 Fate and Transport
- 1.5 Risk Assessment
	- 1.5 .1 Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment
	- 1.5.2 Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment

# 2.0 IDENTIFICATION AND SCREENING OF TECHNOLOGIES

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Remedial Actions Objectives
	- 2.2.1 General Remedial Action Objectives
	- 2.2.2 Media of Interest
		- 2.2.2.1 Soil
		- 2.2.2.2 Sediment
		- 2.2.2.3 Groundwater
		- 2.2.2.4 Surface Water
		- 2.2.2.5 Building Materials
		- 2.2.2.6 Air
	- 2.2.3 Potential Exposure Pathways
	- 2.2.4 Remedial Action Objectives Summary and Site Specific Goals
- 2.3 Response Actions
- 2.4 Estimate of Quantities to be Remediated
- 2.5 Identification and Screening of Technologies
	- 2.5.1 Identification of Technologies
	- 2.5.2 Screening of Technologies
		- 2.5.2.1 No Action

SENECA SEAD-16 and SEAD 17 DRAFT- REPORT SEAD-16 and SEAD 17 FS

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)**

- 2.5.2.2 Institutional Control Technologies
- 2.5.2.3 Containment Technologies
- 2.5.2.4 In-Situ Treatment Technologies
- 2.5 .2.5 Removal Technologies
- 2.5.2.6 Ex-Situ Treatment Technologies
- 2.5.2.7 Disposal

### 3.0 DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3 .2 Assembly of Alternatives
- 3.3 Description of Technologies, Processes and Alternatives
	- 3 .3 .1 General
	- 3.3.2 Remedial Alternatives for Soil and Sediment
		- 3.3.2.1 Alternative 1 No Action
		- 3.3.2.2 Alternative 2 On-Site Containment
		- 3.3.2.3 Alternative 3 In-Situ Treatment
		- 3.3.2.4 Alternative 4 Off-Site Disposal
		- 3.3.2.5 Alternative 5 On-Site Disposal
		- 3.3.2.6 Alternative 6 Innovative Treatment
- 3 .4 Screening Criteria
	- 3.4.1 General
	- 3.4.2 Effectiveness
	- 3.4.3 Implementability
	- 3.4.4 Costs
	- 3.4.5 Numeric Rating System
- 3 .5 Alternatives Screening
	- 3.5.1 Method of Scoring
	- 3.5.2 Effectiveness
		- 3 .5 .2. 1 Short-Term Human Health Protectiveness
		- 3 .5 .2.2 Long-Term Human Health Protectiveness
		- 3 .5 .2.3 Short-Term Environmental Protectiveness
		- 3.5.2.4 Long Term Environmental Protectiveness

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)**

- 3.5.2.5 Reduction in Toxicity
- 3.5.2.6 Reduction in Mobility
- 3.5.2.7 Reduction in Volume
- 3.5.2.8 Permanence
- 3.5.2.9 ARAR Compliance
- 3 .5 .3 Implementability
	- 3.5.3.1 Constructability
	- 3.5.3.2 Long-Term Monitoring
	- 3.5.3.3 Agency Approval
	- 3.5.3.4 Availability
- 3.5.4 Costs
	- 3.5.4.1 Capital Cost
	- 3.5.4.2 Operation and Maintenance Cost
- 3.5.5 Screening

### 4.0 TREATABILITY STUDY

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 General Treatability Studies
- 4.3 Solidification/Stabilization Treatability Studies
- 4.4 Soil Washing Treatability Studies

### 5.0 ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

- 5.1 General
- 5.2 Analysis of Alternative 1: No Action
	- 5.2.1 Definition of Alternative 1
	- 5.2.2 Protection of Human Health and the Environment
		- 5 .2.2.1 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence
	- 5.2.3 Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume
	- 5.2.4 Implementability
	- 5.2.5 Cost
- 5.3 Alternatives 4 Through 6: Common Components
- 5.4 Analysis of Alternative 4: Excavation, Treatment of Soils Failing TCLP,

SENECA SEAD-16 and SEAD 17 DRAFf- REPORT SEAD-16 and SEAD 17 FS

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)**

and Off-Site Landfilling

- 5 .4.1 Definition of Alternative 4
	- 5 .4 .1.1. Description
	- 5.4.1.2 Process Flow and Site Layout
- 5.4.2 Protection of Human Health and the Environment
	- 5.4.2.1 Short-Term Protectiveness
	- 5.4.2.2 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence
	- 5.4.2.3 Conclusion
- 5.4.3 Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility & Volume
- 5.4.4 Implementability
	- 5.4.4.1 Technical Feasibility
	- 5.4.4.2 Administrative Feasibility
	- 5 .4.4.3 Availability of Services & Materials
- 5.4.4 Cost
	- 5.4.5.1 Capital Costs
	- 5.4.5.2 O&M Costs
	- 5.4.5.3 Present Worth Costs
- 5.5 Analysis of Alternative 5: Excavation, Solidification/Stabilization
	- of Soils Failing TCLP, and On-Site Landfilling
	- 5.5.1 Definition of Alternative 5
		- 5 .5 .1.1 Description
		- 5.5.1.2 Process Flow
		- 5.5.1.3 Site Layout
	- 5.5.2 Protection of Human Health and the Environment
		- 5 .5 .2.1 Short-Term Protectiveness
		- 5 .5 .2.2 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence
		- 5.5.2.3 Conclusion
	- 5.5.3 Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility & Volume
	- 5.5.4 Implementability
		- 5.5.4.1 Technical Feasibility
			- 5.5.4.2 Administrative Feasibility
			- 5.5.4.3 Availability of Services & Materials

Page iv k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\toc.doc

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)**

- 5.5.5 Cost
	- 5.5.5.1 Capital Costs
	- 5.5.5.2 O&M Costs
	- 5.5.5.3 Present Worth Costs
- 5.6 Analysis of Alternative 6: Excavation, Soil Washing, Backfill Coarse Fraction, Solidify Fine Fraction, Off-Site Landfill
	- 5.6.1 Definition of Alternative 6
		- 5.6.1.1 Description
		- 5.6.1.2 Process Flow and Site Layout
	- 5.6.2 Protection of Human Health and the Environment
		- 5 .6.2.1 Short-Term Protectiveness
		- 5 .6.2.2 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence
		- 5.6.2.3 Conclusion
	- 5.6.3 Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility & Volume
	- 5.6.4 Implementability
		- 5.6.4.1 Technical Feasibility
		- 5.6.4.2 Administrative Feasibility
		- 5 .6.4.3 Availability of Services & Materials
	- 5.6.5 Cost
		- 5.6.5.1 Capital Costs
		- 5.6.5.2 O&M Costs
		- 5.6.5.3 Present Worth Costs
- 5.7 Comparative Analysis of Alternatives
	- 5.7.1 Introduction
	- 5.7.2 Threshold Criteria
	- 5.7.3 Other Considerations
		- 5.7.3.1 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence
		- 5.7.3 .2 Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility & Volume
		- 5.7.3.3 Short-Term Effectiveness
		- 5.7.3.4 Implementability
	- 5.7.4 Cost
- 5.8 Conclusions

# **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix Title Analytical Results A B Risk Assessment Tables

C Cost Estimates

# **LIST OF TABLES**



# **LIST OF FIGURES**



November 1997

Page viii k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\toc.doc

### **REFERENCES**

- Engineering-Science, Inc., "Remedial Investigation Report at the Open Burning Grounds, March 1994
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "Handbook for Stabilization/Solidification of Hazardous Waste. EPA/540/2-86/001, 1986.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA," October 1988a.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "Technology Screening Guide for Treatment of CERCLA Soils and Sludges." EPA/540/2-88/004, 1988b.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "Stabilization/Solidification of CERCLA and RCRA Wastes." EPA/625/6-89/022, 1989.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "Handbook on In Situ Treatment of Hazardous Waste - Contaminated Soils," January 1990.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "Handbook on Remediation of Contaminated Sediments," April 1991a.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1991b, "Guide for Conducting Treatability Studies Under CERCLA," Interim Guidance, EP A/540/2-91/020A, September 1991.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "The Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation Program," November 1992a.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1992b "Guide for Conducting Treatability Studies Under CERCLA," Final. EPA/540/R-92/07la, October 1992.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), "Vendor Information System for Innovative Treatment Technologies," April 1993.

DRAFT- REPORT SEAD-16 and SEAD 17 FS

### **REFERENCES (CONT'D)**

MAIN, "Workplan for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) of the Open -Burning (OB) Grounds, August 1991.

Means, "Building Construction Cost Data, 51st Ed., 1993.

- United States Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (USAEHA), 1987, Evaluation of Solid Waste Management Units, Seneca Army Depot, Interim Final Report, Groundwater Contamination Survey, No. 38-26-0868-88.
- United States Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHAMA), 1980, Installation Assessment of Seneca Army Depot, Report No. 157, AMXTH-IR-A-157, January 1980.

# **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

# **1.1 PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF REPORT**

This Feasibility Study (FS) report for the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace (SEAD 16) and the Active Deactivation Furnace (SEAD 17) sites at the Seneca Army Depot Activity (SEDA) is a continuation of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) process required for compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response and Compensation Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 and the Superfund Amendments Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986. This program has been performed under the guidance of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region II, and the New York Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). The RI was completed in 1996 and the final draft RI report was submitted to EPA and NYSDEC. The purpose of the RI was to fully characterize the nature and extent of human health and environmental risks posed by the SEAD-16 and 17 sites.

SEDA is under the command control of the Tobyhanna Army Depot in Tobyhanna, PA. SEDA is currently an active Army facility, however, the depot has been placed on the closure list for BRAC 95. SEAD-16 (inactive since the mid-1960s) and SEAD-17 (inactive since 1989) are part of SEDA. Both sites are in proximity to the SEDA complex. SEAD 16 is abandoned with no current site uses. Site use at SEAD 17 is temporarily discontinued. The current intended future land use of the SEAD-16 and 17 has been determined by the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) in conjunction with the Army to be industrial/commercial. As required by CERCLA and Anny regulations, if control of parcels at SEDA is released or transferred and the site-use changes, the Army must perform any remedial actions necessary to ensure that the site conditions resulting from a change is land use are protective of human health and the environment.

A baseline risk assessment (BRA) was conducted for the RI at the SEAD-16 and 17. The risk assessment included an analysis of four receptor categories. These are: 1) current on-site worker, 2) future on-site construction workers, and 3) future on-site industrial workers, and 4) future trespassers. A hazard index and cancer risk were calculated for each applicable receptor exposure route, and a total receptor risk was also calculated. The risk calculations, presented in the RI report and summarized in **Table 1-1** for SEAD-16 and **Table 1-2** for SEAD-17, indicate that under the current land use scenarios for current on-site workers, the risks are within the acceptable levels defined by EPA. For SEAD-16, under the future industrial site use scenario, the site risks exceed the EPA defined target levels for future site construction and industrial workers. Site risks are within acceptable EPA levels for future trespassers under the future industrial site use scenario for SEAD-16. These risks are almost entirely due to the ingestion of

#### 11/05/97

### TABLE 1-1

 $\bar{z}$ 

# CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16



# TABLE 1-2

#### CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 17

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 



and dermal contact to site soils. For SEAD-17, site risks for future land use scenarios for all potential receptors are within acceptable EPA target levels.

This FS will focus on the current and intended future land uses as the basis for remedial action decisions. This report is organized in accordance with "Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA," EPA/540/G-89/004, October 1988 and the New York State Department of Conservation 's "Revised TAGM- Selection of Remedial Actions at Inactive Hazardous Waste Sites." Section 1.0 is divided into five subsections which provide an overview of site conditions, including a brief review of the RI report. Section 1.2 describes the site background. Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 describe the site history, including a site description and the local geologic and hydrogeologic setting. Section 1.3 summarizes the nature and extent of contamination. Section 1.4 discusses the contaminant fate and transport, and Section 1.5 presents the conclusions of the Baseline Risk Assessment (BRA).

Section 2.0 identifies and describes the initial screening of the remedial technologies. Remedial action objectives are developed for each media of concern (e.g., surface soils), and general response actions are considered which meet the remedial objectives for each media. The remedial technologies within each response category are screened for technical feasibility and implementation at SEAD-16 and 17. The discussion of remedial technologies are divided into focused on soil/sediment treatment technologies. The same technologies are applicable at both SEAD-16 and 17. Because of the small volumes for remediation, it is assumed that both sites will be remediated as a unit.

Technologies remaining from the initial screening are combined into remedial alternatives and are presented in Section 3.0. Alternatives for each media are evaluated through preliminary screening to determine their relative merit for use in the remedial action. These alternatives assume implementation at SEAD-16 and 17 as a unit. Separate programs are not considered for either site independently. Section 4.0 describes the treatability testing that may be necessary for alternatives that include innovative technologies prior to their implementation of the remedial actions. In Section 5.0, the remedial action alternatives are screened and evaluated in detail. Also included in Section 5.0 are detailed descriptions of the technologies and their implementation, as well as cost estimates.

# **1.1.1 Operable Units**

In order to facilitate the remedial actions, both SEAD-16 and SEAD-17 have been combined into separate operable units from several operable units. An operable unit, as defined by EPA (40 CFR 300.5) is:

"a discrete action that comprises an incremental step toward comprehensively addressing site problems. This discrete portion of a remedial response manages migration, or eliminates or mitigates a release, threat of a release, or pathway of exposure. The cleanup of a site may be divided into a number of operable units, depending on the complexity of the problems associated with the site. Operable units may address geographical portions of a site, specific site problems, or initial phases of an action, or may consist of any set of actions performed over time or any actions that are concurrent but located in different portions of the site."

SEAD-16 has been combined into one Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU), as has SEAD-17.

# **1.2 SITE BACKGROUND**

## **1.2.1 Site Description**

SEDA is an active military facility constructed in 1941. The site is located approximately 40 miles south of Lake Ontario, near Romulus, New York as shown in **Figure 1-1.** The facility is located in an uplands area, at an elevation of approximately 600 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL), that forms a divide separating two of the New York Finger Lakes, Cayuga Lake on the east and Seneca Lake on the west. Sparsely populated farmland covers most of the surrounding area. New York State Highways 96 and 96A adjoin SEDA on the east and west boundaries, respectively. Since its inception in 1941, SEDA's primary mission has been the receipt, storage, maintenance, and supply of military items.

As shown in **Figure 1-2,** SEAD-16 and SEAD 17 comprise only a few acres within the 10,587 acres that make up the entire SEDA facility. SEAD-16 and 17 were previously used by the Army for munitions deactivation. SEAD-16 is located in the east-central portion of SEDA. It is characterized by 2.6 acres of fenced land **(Figure 1-3).** SEAD 17 is located in the east-central portion of SEDA. It is characterized by an elongated deactivation furnace building that is surrounded by a crushed shale road **(Figure 1-4).** 

## **1.2.1.1 Geologic Setting**

The Finger Lakes uplands area is underlain by a broad north-to-south trending series of rock terraces mantled by glacial till. As part of the Appalachian Plateau, the region is underlain by a tectonically undisturbed sequence of Paleozoic rocks consisting of shales, sandstones, conglomerates, limestones and dolostones.



R:\GRAPHICS\SENECA\LOCMPI-1.CDR(CLD)



R:\GRAPHICS\SENECA\BASEMAP\FINBS1-2.CDR(CLD)

 $\label{eq:1.1} \frac{g_j}{2g} = \frac{g_j}{2g} \left( \frac{g_j}{2g} \right)$ 











The Hamilton Group, 600 to 1500 feet thick, is divided into four formations. They are, from oldest to youngest, the Marcellus, Skaneateles, Ludlowville, and Moscow formations. The western portion of SEDA is generally located in the Ludlowville Formation while the eastern portion is located in the younger Moscow Formation. The Ludlowville and Moscow formations are characterized by gray, calcareous shales and mudstones and thin limestones with numerous zones of abundant invertebrate fossils that form geographically widespread encrinites, coral-rich layers, and complex shell beds. The Ludlowville Formation is known to contain brachiopods, bivalves, trilobites, corals and bryozoans (Gray, 1991). In contrast, the lower two formations (Skaneateles and Marcellus) consist largely of black and dark gray sparsely fossiliferous shales (Brett et al., 1991). Locally, the shale is soft, gray, and fissile.

The predominant surficial geologic unit present at the site is dense till. The till is distributed across the entire Depot and generally ranges in thickness from 3 feet to approximately 15 feet, although it is generally between 6 and 10 feet thick; at a few locations the thickness of the till is greater than 30 feet. The till is generally characterized as brown to olive-gray silt and clay, with little fine sand and variable amounts of fine to coarse gravel-sized inclusions of dark gray shale. Larger diameter clasts of shale (as large as 6 inches in diameter) are sometimes present in the basal portion of the till and are probably rip-up clasts removed from the weathered shale zone and incorporated into the till by the once-active glacier. Grain size analyses of the till show a wide distribution of particle sizes within the till (Metcalf & Eddie, 1989), however, there is a high percentage of silt and clay with the balance comprised of coarser particles. The porosities of 5 gray-brown silt clay (i.e., till) samples ranged from 34.0 percent to 44.2 percent with an average of 37.3 percent (USAEHA, 1985).

Darien silt-loam soils, 0 to 18 inches thick, have developed over the Wisconsin age till at both SEAD-16 and SEAD-17. These soils are poorly drained and have a silt clay loam and a clay subsoil. In general, the topographic relief associated with these soils is 3 to 8 percent.

Regionally, four distinct hydrologic units have been identified within Seneca County (Mozola, 1951). These include two distinct shale formations, a series of limestone units, and unconsolidated beds of Pleistocene glacial drift. Overall, the groundwater in the county is very hard, and therefore, the quality is minimally acceptable for use as potable water. Regionally, the water table aquifer of the unconsolidated surficial glacial deposits of the region would be expected to flow in a direction consistent with the dropping ground surface elevations. Geologic cross-sections from Seneca Lake and Cayuga Lake have been constructed by the State of New York, (Mozola, 1951). This crosssection information, along with groundwater flow directions established at numerous sites on SEDA and stream drainage patterns in the area, suggests that a groundwater divide exists approximately half way between the two finger lakes; the divide is believed to run approximately parallel to Route 96 near the eastern boundary of SEDA. Further evidence for the divide is

provided in Parsons ES (1995). SEDA is located on the western slope of this divide and, therefore, regional groundwater flow on the depot is expected to be west toward Seneca Lake.

The geologic information reviewed indicates that the upper portions of the shale formation would be expected to yield small, yet adequate, supplies of water for domestic use. For mid-Devonian shales such as those of the Hamilton group, the average yields, (which are less than 15 gpm), are consistent with what would be expected for shales (LaSala, 1968). The deeper portions of the bedrock, (i.e., at depths greater than 235 feet) have provided yields up to 150 gpm. At these depths the high well yields may be attributed to the effect of solutioning on the Onondaga limestone, which is at the base of the Hamilton Group. Based on well yield data, the degree of solutioning is affected by the type and thickness of overlying material (Mozola, 1951). Solution effects on limestones (and on shales which contain gypsum) in the Erie-Niagara have been reported by LaSala (1968). This source of water is considered to comprise a separate source of groundwater for the area. Very few wells in the region adjacent to SEDA utilize the limestone as a source of water, which may be due to the drilling depths required to intercept this water.

#### $1.2.2$ **Site History**

SEDA was constructed in 1941 and has been owned by the United States Government and operated by the Department of the Army since this time. Prior to construction of the depot, the site was used for farming. The Abandoned Deactivation Furnace (SEAD-16) has been in use from approximately 1945 to the mid-1960s. Small arms munitions, both obsolete and unserviceable, were destroved by incineration. There were no air pollution or dust control devices installed on the furnace during the time that it operated. The overhead pipes connecting Building S-311 and 366 were used to convey propellants in the deactivation process; it is also likely that propellants were stored in these buildings.

#### **Previous Investigations** 1.2.2.1

SEAD-16 and 17 are described in four previous reports. The first report is a SWMU Classification Report (Parsons ES, 1994a) that describes and evaluates the Solid Waste Management Units at SEDA. This report was intended to provide a cursory evaluation of all the SWMUs at SEDA. The second report is the Work Plan for CERCLA Expanded Site Inspection (ESI) of Ten Solid Waste Management Units written by Parsons Main, Inc. in January 1993. This report detailed the site work and sampling to be performed under the Expanded Site Investigation (ESI) The third report, the SWMU Classification Report (Parsons ES, 1995a), presents the results of a more detailed investigation of SEAD-16 and SEAD-17. The fourth report, which only applies to SEAD-16, is a Final Closure Report for the Underground Storage Tank Removal at Seneca Army Depot Activity, Romulus, New York (Science Applications International Corporation, May 1994). This report describes the removal, sampling, and conformatory laboratory analysis activities for two USTs at **SEAD-16.** 

All previous investigations of the SEAD-16 and 17 site are summarized in chronological order in the RI.

#### $1.3$ **NATURE AND EXTENT OF CONSTITUENTS OF CONCERN**

The nature and extent of the chemicals of concern at the SEAD-16 and 17 were evaluated through a comprehensive field investigation program. Primary media investigated at the SEAD-16 and 17 included building materials, indoor air quality, surface and subsurface soil (from borings), surface water and sediment (from on-site ditches and drainage swales), and groundwater (from monitoring wells).

Concentrations above the NYSDEC Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum (TAGM) clean-up guidelines were measured in this area at all depths from land surface to the top of the weathered shale. TAGMS are used by NYSDEC for establishing cleanup guidelines. The TAGMS are not promulgated standards and therefore are not ARARs but rather are To Be Considered (TBC) guidelines. As such, remedy selection will be based upon other enforceable standards that are ARARs. However, if appropriate, TAGMs may be used to help determine treatment volumes such as cubic yards of soil.

Surface water at SEAD-16 and 17 have not been classified by NYSDEC. However, because the drainage ditches near SEAD 16 and SEAD-17 form the headwaters for Kendaia Creek, the lower portion of which is designated as Class C surface water by NYSDEC, the Class C standards were used to provide a basis of comparison for the on-site surface water chemical data. The Class C Standards are not strictly applicable to the surface water found at SEAD-16.

Sediment results were compared to the most conservative New York State Guidelines for sediment, including: New York State lowest effect level (NYS LEL), New York State human health bioaccumulation criteria (NYS HHB), New York State benthic aquatic life acute and chronic toxicity criteria (NYS BALAT and NYS BALCT, respectively), and New York State wildlife bioaccumulation criteria (NYS WB).

All analytical results and their respective guidance values have been included in Appendix A.

#### SEAD-16

On the basis of the analytical results obtained for the 7 media at SEAD-16, the most significant impact to the site is from metals. Impacts from SVOCs and pesticides were also identified.

In the soil at SEAD-16, metals and SVOCs, predominantly PAH compounds, were found to be pervasive, particularly in the surface and subsurface soils adjacent to the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace. Lead, copper, arsenic, and zinc were detected in almost all of the surface soil samples at concentrations above their respective TAGM values. On the basis of the surface soil data, the highest concentrations of metals were clearly located in the area between the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace Building (S-311) and the Process Support Building (366). In the subsurface soil, copper and lead were found to be the most pervasive. The highest concentrations of PAH compounds in surface soils were detected in samples from locations adjacent to the northwestern corner of the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace Building. Nitroaromatic compounds were also present in the surface and subsurface soil near both buildings. Impacts from pesticides, PCBs, and herbicides in soil were less significant than the impacts from SVOCs and metals.

In the shallow groundwater aquifer, seven metals were detected above their respective NYS Class GA or federal MCL standards. Impacts from SVOCs and nitroaromatics were less significant. No VOCs, pesticides, or PCBs were detected in groundwater at SEAD-16.

Generally, surface water impacts were from metals, six of which were found at concentrations that exceeded their standards at several locations. The metals included lead, copper, zinc, cadmium, selenium, and iron. Three of these metals (lead, copper and zinc) were also found to be widely distributed in surface soils on-site, and thus, surface soils are a likely source area for the metals found in the surface water samples. SVOCs were found in a few surface water samples, but only one was above the NYS Class C standard. Many of the other chemical constituents analyzed for were not present in the samples. No VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, or nitroaromatics were detected in the samples

Sediment impacts were primarily from SVOCs and pesticides, which were pervasive. Several pesticide compounds exceeded their respective NYS sediment criteria and by far the most significant exceedences were in the sediment sample, SW/SD16-1, which was collected from the northeastern corner of the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace. Several metals were detected at concentrations above the NYS LEL with the highest concentrations found at SW/SD16-3 and SW/SD16-10. Impacts from nitroaromatics were less significant.

In the building material samples collected from the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace Building (S-311) and the Process Support Building (366), metals, SVOCs, and nitroaromatics were detected above their TAGM values. The metals antimony, copper, lead, and zinc were detected in all 12 of the building material samples at concentrations above their respective TAGM values. The SVOCs found were mostly PAHs, and among these benzo(a)pyrene was found at the highest concentration  $(1,500 \mu g/Kg)$ . The maximum concentration of total carcinogenic PAHs was 54,000 µg/Kg, which was found in a propellant residue sample (BS-10). The highest concentrations of nitroaromatics were found in the vacuum system recovery vats in Building 366, where 2,4-dinitrotoluene was found at concentrations of 19,000,000 µg/Kg and 3,700,000 ug/Kg. Impacts from VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, and herbicides were less significant. Asbestos was detected at 13 locations in the two buildings in such materials as pipe insulation, roofing material, and floor tiles.

#### **SEAD-17**

On the basis of the analytical results obtained for the five media at SEAD-17, the most significant impacts to the site are from metals. Impacts from SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, herbicides, and nitroaromatics were also found...

In the soil at SEAD-17, metals were found to be pervasive in the surface and subsurface soils.. Twenty-one metals were detected in the surface soils at concentrations above their respective TAGM values. Antimony, arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc were detected in almost all of the surface soil samples at concentrations above their respective TAGM values. In the subsurface soils, lead was detected in all samples at concentrations above the TAGM value. The metals were generally evenly distributed around Building 367 at SEAD-17, although some of the highest concentrations were located immediately to the southwest of the building. A potential source for some the high concentrations of metals in this area of the site is a discharge pipe, which has an outfall near location SS17-18, that drains the retort inside Building 367. Impacts from VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, herbicides, and nitroaromatics in soil were less significant than the impacts from metals.

Generally, the groundwater at SEAD-17 has not been significantly impacted by any of the chemical constituents. Low concentrations of SVOCs were detected. Two metals did exceed their criteria values. Additionally, no VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, or nitroaromatics were detected in the groundwater.

Surface water impacts were not widespread and many of the chemical constituents analyzed for were not present in the samples. Most of the impacts from metals occurred in the surface water samples from the drainage ditch south of the Deactivation Furnace. No VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, or nitroaromatics were detected in the samples.

Sediment impacts were from SVOCs, pesticides, and metals. Impacts from SVOCs were most significant at one location in the drainage ditch in the northeastern corner of the site. Pesticides were found in the drainage ditches in the western and northeastern portions of the site. Metals impacts were found at SW/SD17-3, which is located in the drainage ditch in the eastern portion of the site. No PCBs or nitroaromatics were detected.

#### **FATE AND TRANSPORT** 1.4

Analysis of the fate and transport mechanisms for the chemicals of concern at the SEAD-16 and 17 considered site specific factors as well as expected chemical and physical behaviors of the contaminants. Soil, sediment, and surface water samples collected off-site, and downstream of the site were used to quantify the extent of impacts to various media.

Based on the distributions and concentrations of parameters measured on the sites, inorganics are believed to be the most significant in terms of determining their transport. On this basis, cursory transport modeling or inorganics was performed. This modeling was intended to provide some insight as to which organics may pose a future threat to groundwater at both SEAD-16 and SEAD-17. It may also be used to provide a focus and direction for future, more detailed modeling at SEAD-16 and SEAD-17. Transport modeling of the other constituents was not performed.

Inorganics of concern at SEAD-16 and SEAD-17 are Arsenic, Antimony, Copper, Cadmium, Lead, Silver, and Zinc. These metals are transported primarily by leaching and groundwater flow. Soil and groundwater samples collected during the RI confirm that these materials are present in the surface and subsurface soils as well as in the groundwater. Once these materials have entered the subsurface, they may migrate through the unsaturated vadose zone and/or infiltrate into the groundwater system. A series of publicly available models was used to evaluate the transport of inorganics at SEAD-16 and SEAD-17. These models are used and accepted by the USEPA to conservatively estimate soil inorganic contributions to underlying groundwater via the leaching pathway. A detailed discussion of these numerical models and their application, assumptions used, input parameters, and sensitivity analyses is included in the RI Report (Parsons ES, 1997) and in Appendix E. The following summarizes model results.

#### **SEAD-16**

The results of the model indicate that base case maximum leaching concentrations were for lead and copper (55.73 mg/l and 65.27 mg/l, respectively), each of which is above its applicable groundwater standard. The times for these maximum concentrations to occur were predicted to be 785 years for lead and 170 years for copper. The second highest maximum concentration was for zinc, at 26.45 mg/l in 130 years. A sensitivity analysis showed that worst case scenario leaching concentrations could be as much as 305.12 mg/l in 145 years for lead and 194.66 mg/l in 60 years for copper. The worst case concentration for zinc was predicted to be 170.05 mg/l in 20 years.

The concentrations above were assumed to be concentrations of solute at the unsaturatedsaturated zone interface in order to predict worst-case concentrations that will impact the groundwater. Modeling results indicate that lead will exceed its EPA MCL of 15  $\mu$ g/l in 205 years, and reach a maximum concentration in groundwater of  $2,721 \mu g/l$  in approximately 785 years. Copper will exceed its EPA MCL of 200 μg/l in 85 years, and reach a maximum concentration in groundwater of 3,190  $\mu$ g/l in approximately 175 years. Zinc will exceed its EPA MCL of 300  $\mu$ g/l in 65 years, and reach a maximum concentration in groundwater of 1,428  $\mu$ g/l in approximately 130 years.

### **SEAD-17**

The results of the model indicate that base case maximum leaching concentration was for zinc, at 8.20 mg/l, which is above its applicable groundwater standard. The second highest maximum concentrations were for lead and copper at 3.60 mg/l and 3.41 mg/l, respectively, which is also above their applicable groundwater standards. The times for these maximum concentrations to occur were predicted to be 120 years for zinc, 170 years for copper, and 785 years for lead. A sensitivity analysis showed that worst case scenario leaching concentrations for zinc, copper, and lead could be as much as 52.01 mg/l in 20 years, 10.07 mg/l in 55 years, and 19.72 mg/l in 145 years, respectively.

The concentrations above were assumed to be concentrations of solute at the unsaturatedsaturated zone interface in order to predict worst-case concentrations that will impact the groundwater. Modeling results indicate that lead and zinc will exceed their respective EPA MCLs of 15 µg/l and 300 µg/l in 340 years and 50 years. Maximum concentrations in groundwater will reach 274  $\mu$ g/l in approximately 785 years for lead and 578  $\mu$ g/l in 120 years for zinc. Although cadmium concentrations at the unsaturated-saturated zone interface were only predicted to reach a maximum of 0.59 mg/l in 20 years (worst case), because of the large area over which cadmium was detected, it is expected to exceed its groundwater standard of 5  $\mu$ g/l 30 years, and to reach a maximum of 14.64  $\mu$ g/l in approximately 55 years. The high concentration of copper predicted at the unsaturated-saturated zone interface is not expected to exceed its groundwater standard of  $200 \mu g/l$ .

#### **RISK ASSESSMENT** 1.5

The objectives of the baseline risk assessment are to: help determine whether additional response actions are necessary at the site, to provide a basis for determining residual chemical levels that are adequately protective of human health and the environment, to provide a basis for comparing potential health impacts of various remedial alternatives, and to evaluate selection of the "No Action" remedial alternative, where appropriate. To meet these objectives, the Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund (RAGS) (USEPA, 1989a) was followed wherever possible and applicable.

The baseline risk assessment is divided into two basic components: the human health evaluation and the ecological risk assessment evaluation. Separate risk calculations are presented for current and future on-site land-use scenarios.

#### $1.5.1$ **Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment**

The current and future intended land use for SEAD-16 and 17 will not change from current land use which is industrial. There are no current plans to use this site for residential purposes. The future intended use of the site was determined by the BRAC process in July 1995.

Human health risk assessments were calculated for four exposure scenarios:

- current on-site worker; 1)
- future on-site worker; and  $2)$
- future on-site construction worker; and 3)
- future potential trespasser. 4)

### **SEAD-16**

Future on-site industrial and on-site construction workers are the receptors exhibiting a potential for adverse noncarcinogenic health threats above the USEPA target level. As shown on Table 1-1, the RME hazard index of 11.9 calculated for the future industrial worker scenario is due primarily to ingestion of indoor dust. The RME hazard index of 1.74 calculated for the future on-site construction worker scenario is due to both ingestion of outdoor dust and ingestion of onsite soils. The cancer risks for all receptors and pathways are below USEPA target levels. The highest calculated RME cancer risk is  $3.17 \times 10^{-5}$  for ingestion of indoor dust by future industrial workers.

### SEAD-17

Potential receptors exhibiting the greatest risk for adverse noncarcinogenic health threats are future on-site construction workers. As shown on Table 1-2, the RME hazard index of 0.839 is due primarily to ingestion of on-site soil for future on-site construction workers. This is below the USEPA target level of 1.0. The cancer risks for all receptors and pathways are also below UESPA target levels. The highest calculated RME cancer risk is  $1.79 \times 10^{-6}$  for ingestion of onsite soils by future industrial workers.

#### 1.5.2 **Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment**

The ecological risk assessment was performed following the guidance presented in the New York State Division of Fish and Wildlife Impact Analysis for Inactive Hazardous Waste Sites (NYSDEC 1994), the Framework for Ecological Risk Assessment (EPA, 1992f), and the Procedural Guidelines for Ecological Risk Assessment at U.S. Army Sites, Vol. 1 (Wentsel et al., 1994). The results of the ERA indicate that the COPCs identified at SEAD-16 and 17 are considered to pose a negligible risk to the ecosystem surrounding the site.

The SEAD-16 and 17 ERA has included both a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the ecological status of the Unit. Phase I field evaluations included the characterization and description of the local wildlife habitat and ecological conditions within the study area. The conclusions determined from these field efforts indicated a diverse and healthy aquatic and terrestrial environment. No overt acute toxic impacts were evidenced during the field evaluation.

Quantitative sediment and surface water analytical data were compared to USEPA and NYSDEC guidelines for the protection of aquatic and macroinvertebrate life in sediments and surface water. Additionally, as a supplement to specific guidelines, criteria, which are protective of terrestrial wildlife and vegetation in soils, were also considered.

The quantitative ecological risk evaluation, which involved comparisons of the ecological assessment endpoint exposures with the toxicity reference values, initially suggested that a slight possibility exists for the COPCs to present a small potential for environmental effects. In addition, six inorganic elements and two endosulfan compounds at SEAD-16 present a potential for greater exposure to result in environmental effects. However, the effects from these analytes have not been observed during fieldwork, i.e. the ecological community appears diverse and normal. Furthermore, upon considering the weight of evidence presented in the Ecological Risk Summary section (Sections 6.6.4.3.1 and 7.6.4.3.1 of the RI, Parsons ES, 1997) and the very conservative assumptions used in the ERA, the COPCs identified at SEAD-16 and 17 are considered to pose a low risk to the ecosystem of the SEAD-16 and a negligible risk to the ecosystem of the SEAD-17 study area.

one for an interest from the Product of the company company and the first state of the first part of any

#### $2.0$ **IDENTIFICATION AND SCREENING OF TECHNOLOGIES**

#### $2.1$ **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this section is to develop and screen an appropriate range of remedial technologies that will eventually be combined as remedial alternatives and undergo further screening in Section 3.0. Technologies were developed following the standard USEPA method of identifying and screening technologies/processes. The approach consists of six steps:

- Develop remedial action objectives that specify media of interest, chemical constituents of concern, and the results of the BRA in Sections 6.0 and 7.0 of the SEAD-16 and 17 RI.
- Develop general response actions for each medium of interest that will satisfy each remedial action objective for the site.
- Estimate quantities of media to which general response actions will be applied to meet remedial action objectives.
- Identify remediation technologies/processes associated with each general response action. Screen and eliminate technologies/processes based on technical implementibility.
- Evaluate technologies/processes and retain processes that are representative of each technology.
- Assemble and further screen the retained technologies/processes into a range of alternatives as appropriate. In Section 5.0 the remaining alternatives are analyzed in detail.

This six-step approach to technology screening and alternatives development is described in the following subsections.

#### REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES  $2.2$

#### **General Remedial Action Objectives**  $2.2.1$

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) clean-up process is a risk based process when considering remedial action. It requires that the overall objective of any remedial response is to reduce the environmental and human health risks of the chemicals present in the various environmental media to within established EPA target ranges. Remedial action objectives are developed to meet this overall objective, and specify media of concern, potential exposure pathways, and remediation goals. These goals establish acceptable exposure levels that are used as a basis for developing remedial alternatives.

The National Contingency Plan (NCP) requires that CERCLA remedial actions comply with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs). ARARs are promulgated standards that are applicable to the process of site clean-up after a remedial action has been chosen for implementation. Chemical specific standards, action specific standards, location specific standards, and federal and state environmental regulations are all examples of potential ARARs. However, there are currently no promulgated state or federal standards that establish soil or sediment quality, which are the media of interest at SEAD-16 and 17 as discussed in the following sections.

In addition, CERCLA, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986, requires that a CERCLA remedial action must:

- Use remedial alternatives that permanently and significantly reduce the volume, toxicity, or mobility of hazardous substances;
- Select remedial actions that protect human health and the environment, are cost effective, and involve permanent solutions, alternative solutions and resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent possible;
- Avoid off-site transport and disposal of untreated hazardous substances or contaminated materials where practical technologies exist to treat these materials on-site.
Remedial action objectives for SEAD-16 and 17 have been developed which consist of medium specific objectives designed to be protective of human health and the environment. Where practicable, consideration was given to the NCP preference for permanent solutions. These objectives are:

The remedial action objectives for the SEAD-16 and 17 operable units are as follows:

- Prevent public or other persons from direct contact with adversely impacted soils, sediments, solid waste and surface water that may present a health risk.
- Eliminate or minimize the migration of hazardous constituents from soil to groundwater and downgradient surface water.
- Prevent off-site migration of constituents above levels protective of public health and the environment.
- Restore soil, and sediments to levels that are protective of public health and the environment.

The following sections describe how these general remedial action objectives were determined and the development of remedial actions to attain these objectives. Technologies capable of accomplishing the remedial action objectives have been screened for applicability and are assembled into remedial alternatives in Section 3.0.

## $2.2.2$ **Media of Interest**

The selection of the media of interest was based upon two general remedial action objectives: those media that contribute the greatest risk and cause an exceedance of an EPA target risk level, and those media that do not comply with ARARs. The remedial investigation has examined all media at SEAD-16 and 17. Discrete samples of the on-site and off-site surface water, the on-site sediment, the on-site soil and the on-site groundwater and Buildings S-311 and 366 at SEAD-16 have been sampled and analyzed using EPA and NYSDEC established analytical techniques. This process has yielded high quality data meeting all established Data Quality Objectives (DQO's) which has been used to determine the need for and extent of remediation.

The media of interest and the locations that may require a remedial action were selected by evaluating the benefits gained by implementing such an action. The benefits of a CERCLA remedial effort is defined by the extent that a proposed action will eliminate or decrease the risk to within acceptable levels. Reasonable decisions are then possible regarding the media and the extent of specific areas that need to be addressed. In this manner, if the conclusion is reached to perform a remedial action then the volume of material to be treated and the benefits produced by such an action are clear.

Although lead, a heavy metal found in the site soils and sediments at both sites, was not part of the risk analysis, it should be considered. Lead was not considered in the risk assessment because the EPA has withdrawn the allowable Reference Dose (RfD) values for lead. However, based on prior discussion and agreement between the Army and the EPA regarding lead in soils at the OB Grounds at SEDA (Parsons ES, 1997), a negotiated value of 500 mg/kg in soils is considered the EPA guidance value for lead in soils at SEDA. This value is used to evaluate the extent of remediation at SEAD-16 and 17. Similarly, a value of 31 mg/kg for lead in sediments will be used to evaluate remediation of sediments at SEAD-16 and 17. This value is based on the NYSDEC Lower Exposure Limit, which is not a promulgated regulation but a guidance value used for evaluation of SEDA sites as agreed between the Army and the EPA.

Based on the results of the BRA and an evaluation of lead concentrations, surface soil, subsurface soil, and sediment were determined to require Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) at both sites. In addition, at SEAD-16, the indoor air and surfaces inside the abandoned Buildings S-311 and 366 also require RAOs. Tables 2-1 summarizes RAOs for SEAD-16, and Table 2-2 summarizes RAOs for SEAD-17.

## $2.2.2.1$ Soil

In the soil at SEAD-16, metals and SVOCs, predominantly PAH compounds, were found to be pervasive, particularly in the surface and subsurface soils adjacent to the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace. Of the metals that were detected, 14 metals were considered to be more toxic. Lead, copper, arsenic, and zinc were detected in almost all of the surface soil samples at elevated concentrations. On the basis of the surface soil data, the highest concentrations of metals were clearly located in the area between the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace Building (S-311) and the Process Support Building (366). In the subsurface soils, copper and lead were found to be most pervasive. The highest concentrations of PAH compounds in surface soils were detected in samples collected from locations adjacent to the northwestern corner of the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace Building. Nitroaromatic compounds were also present in the surface and subsurface soils near both buildings. Impacts from pesticides, PCBs, and herbicides in soil were less significant than the impacts from SVOCs and metals. This media has therefore been retained as a media of interest.

November 1997

Page 2-4 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc



## SEAD-16 AREAS FOR REMEDIATION



<u>Notes:</u><br>1) For Case 4, area to be remediated/excavated includes an additional 24 inches in depth within the areas considered by Case 1 (see Figure 2-1).<br>2) Areas for case 1 is the total plan areas of Buidings S-311 and 36

Cases 2-4 are surface extent of soils/sediments to be excavated.

3) Bold items in Sampling Location Column are additional locations to be remediated/excavated when the case is considered.

Table 2-2<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

## SEAD-17 AREAS FOR REMEDIATION



Notes:

1) For Case 3, area to be remediated/excavated includes an additional 24 inches in depth within the areas considered by Case 1 (see Figure 2-1).<br>2) Bold items in Sampling Location Column are additional locations to be reme

h:\encl^eneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2\_1&2.XLS

**11/18/97** 

In the soil at SEAD-17, metals were found to be pervasive in the surface and subsurface soils.. Twenty-one metals were detected in the surface soils at elevated concentrations, including antimony, arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc. In the subsurface soils, lead was detected in all samples at elevated concentrations. The metals were generally evenly distributed around Building 367 at SEAD-17, although some of the highest concentrations were located immediately to the southwest of the building. A potential source for some the high concentrations of metals in this area of the site is a discharge pipe, which has an outfall near location SS17-18, that drains the retort inside Building 367. Impacts from VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, herbicides, and nitroaromatics in soil were less significant than the impacts from metals.

A detailed description of soil analytical results can be found in the SEAD-16 and 17 RI (Parsons ES, 1997).

## $2.2.2.2$ **Sediment**

At SEAD-16, sediment impacts were primarily from SVOCs, metals, and pesticides, which were pervasive. Several pesticide compounds exceeded their respective NYS sediment criteria and by far the most significant exceedences were in the sediment sample, SW/SD16-1, which was collected from the northeastern corner of the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace. Several metals were detected at concentrations above the NYS LEL with the highest concentrations found at SW/SD16-3 and SW/SD16-10. Impacts from nitroaromatics were less significant.

At SEAD-17 sediment impacts were also from SVOCs, pesticides, and metals. Impacts from SVOCs were most significant in the drainage ditch in the northeastern corner of the site. Pesticides were found in the drainage ditches in the western and northeastern portions of the site. Metals impacts were found at SW/SD17-3, which is located in the drainage ditch in the eastern portion of the site. No PCBs or nitroaromatics were detected.

A detailed description of soil analytical results for sediment can be found in the SEAD-16 and 17 RI (Parsons ES, 1997).

## Groundwater 2.2.2.3

In the groundwater at SEAD-16 seven metals were detected above the respective NYS Class GA or federal MCL standards. Impacts from SVOCs and nitroaromatics were less significant. No VOCs, pesticides, or PCBs were detected in the groundwater at SEAD-16.

The groundwater at SEAD-17 has not been significantly impacted by any of the chemical constituents. Low concentrations of SVOCs were detected. Two metals, lead and thallium did exceed their Federal EPA MCL values. Additionally, no VOCs, pesticides, PCBs,  $\alpha$ nitroaromatics were detected in the groundwater.

A detailed discussion of analytical results for groundwater can be found in the SEAD-16 and 17 RI.

Although lead was detected in groundwater, from a risk standpoint there are no exposure pathways for groundwater that would increase risk for human receptors. In addition, several site factors inhibit the movement of contaminants in groundwater and preclude the likelihood that groundwater could acquire an exposure pathway.

Hydraulic conductivities in both the till/weathered shale and in competent shale are low. Groundwater velocities calculated in Section 3.0 of the RI are between 0.4 and 1.4 feet per day, which is 151-504 feet per year. Groundwater moving at this speed will travel one mile in 10-35 years and the nearest drinking water will is located well outside of a one mile radius around the site.

A similar situation exists for SEAD-17. Hydraulic conductivities are low, and groundwater velocities calculated in Section 3.0 of the RI are between 1.0 and 1.3 feet per day, or 365-475 feet per year. The time to travel one mile is 11-14 years, and any drinking water wells in the area are located well outside a one-mile radius of the site.

Although metals may be subject to movement with soil water and in this way be transported to groundwater, the rate of migration does not equal the rate of water movement due to fixation and adsorption reactions (Dragun, 1988). Metals may become immobilized by mechanisms of adsorption and precipitation, which prevent movement. In the case of lead, which is a primary constituent of concern at SEAD-16 and 17, soluble lead added to soil reacts with clays, phosphates, sulfates, carbonates, hydroxides and organic matter such that its mobility is greatly Reduced mobility of lead coupled with low hydraulic conductivities, therefore, reduced.

November 1997

Page 2-8 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc extremely limit the likelihood that lead will travel far enough to pose risks to human health or the environment.

In addition, the future land use of SEAD-16 and 17 has been designated for industrial purposes, not as a residential area. From the standpoint of land use, it is unlikely that private wells would be installed in the overburden/weathered shale aquifer at SEAD-16 and 17 for the purpose of extracting groundwater to drink.

Further, even if in the unlikely event that groundwater was to be used as a source of drinking water, it is unlikely that the aquifer could be used for that purpose. For groundwater to be used as a reasonable source of drinking water, requirements for quality and quantity must be satisfied. These requirements are established the NYS Department of Health (NYSDOH) and are detailed in the bulletin titled Rural Water Supply, which sets forth the requirements for an individual water supply system. NYSDOH indicates that a private well should be developed from a water bearing formation at a depth greater than 20 feet below the ground surface. In the case of SEAD-16 and 17 a depth greater that 20 feet would be below the overburden/shale aquifer where all groundwater measurements have been obtained from. Water at depths greater than 20 feet would be less available than water in the shallower overburden/shale formation due to the poor hydraulic characteristics of the bedrock. Typical water wells in the area drilled to depths in the bedrock approaching 200 feet or more.

Therefore, groundwater is not a media of interest. However, limiting contaminant sources in soil that may migrate has been considered in the formulation of the remedial action objectives.

## 2.2.2.4 **Surface Water**

Generally, surface water impacts at SEAD-16 were from metals, six of which were found at concentrations that exceeded their standards at several locations. The metals included lead, copper, zinc, cadmium, selenium, and iron. Three of these metals (lead, copper and zinc) were also found to be widely distributed in surface soils on-site, and thus, surface soils are a likely source area for the metals found in the surface water samples. SVOCs were found in a few surface water samples, but only one was above the NYS Class C standard. Many of the other chemical constituents analyzed for were not present in the samples. No VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, or nitroaromatics were detected in the samples.

Surface water impacts at SEAD-17 were not widespread and many of the chemical constituents analyzed for were not present in the samples. Most of the impacts from metals occurred in the surface water samples from the drainage ditch south of the Deactivation Furnace. No VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, or nitroaromatics were detected in the samples.

Since the impacts to surface water appear to be caused by contaminants in soils at both sites, protection of surface water is a remedial action objective. However, due to the limited extent of impacts to surface water, it is not retained as a media of interest.

## **Building Materials** 2.2.2.5

In the building material samples collected from the Abandoned Deactivation Furnace Building (S-311) and the Process Support Building (366) at SEAD-16, SVOCs and nitroaromatics were detected at elevated levels. The metals antimony, copper, lead, and zinc were also detected in all 12 of the building material samples at elevated concentrations. The SVOCs found were mostly PAHs, and among these benzo(a)pyrene was found at the highest concentration  $(1,500 \mu g/Kg)$ . The maximum concentration of total carcinogenic PAHs was 54,000 µg/Kg, which was found in a propellant residue sample (BS-10). The highest concentrations of nitroaromatics were found in the vacuum system recovery vats in Building 366, where 2,4-dinitrotoluene was found at concentrations of 19,000,000 µg/Kg and 3,700,000 µg/Kg. Impacts from VOCs, pesticides, PCBs, and herbicides were less significant. Asbestos was detected at 13 locations in the two buildings in such materials as pipe insulation, roofing material, and floor tiles. The surfaces of the buildings are therefore retained as media of interest. A detailed discussion of analytical results for building materials can be found in the SEAD-16 and 17 RI (Parsons ES, 1997).

## Air 2.2.2.6

Both ambient air and air inside Building S-311 at SEAD-16 were evaluated as a potential media of interest. Ambient air was discounted as a media of interest for the following reasons. As part of the risk assessment process, the human health impacts due to the inhalation of fugitive dust in ambient air was considered using EPA approved atmospheric dispersion models of the on-site soil material. This evaluation indicated that ingestion of fugitive dust was generally at least of magnitude lower in carcinogenic risk than the most significant risk pathway, which was ingestion of on-site soil. For example, for the current industrial on-site worker at SEAD-16, the carcinogenic risk due to inhalation of dust is  $6.94 \times 10^{-11}$ , whereas the carcinogenic risk due to ingestion of soil is  $1.30 \times 10^{-6}$  (see Table 1-1). Although non-carcinogenic risk was about the

November 1997

Page 2-10 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc same and even if this pathway was considered significant, the focus of any risk reduction efforts would be with the on-site surface soils rather than the ambient air.

The indoor air samples form the abandoned Building S-311 at SEAD-16 show similar risk assessment results to ambient air in that ingestion and dermal contact of indoor dust contribute much more significantly to human health risk. In addition, the source of contaminants in indoor air is likely particles and dust from indoor surfaces, which are the focus of risk reduction efforts rather than the indoor air itself. Therefore, indoor air has been discounted as a media of interest.

## **Potential Exposure Pathways**  $2.2.3$

As described in the BRA in Sections 6.0 and 7.0 of the RI and summarized in Section 1.0 of this report, the risks at SEAD-16 and 17 are primarily due to ingestion of site soils and inhalation of dust from site soils and building debris. Pathways considered for the future trespasser receptor scenario included surface water ingestion and dermal contact, as well as sediment ingestion and dermal contact. However, the risks calculated from these exposure pathyways were well below acceptable levels. There are no exposure pathyways for groundwater. Accordingly, the remedial action objectives focus on site soils and sediments.

## $2.2.4$ **Remedial Action Objective Summary and Site Specific Goals**

Because the hazard index at SEAD-16 for future industrial and construction workers is above the EPA acceptable level of 1.0, remedial action must be undertaken to reduce human health risk. In addition, lead is present in soils above the action levels previously discuss of 500 mg/kg at both sites. This level is the clean up goal for surface soil and subsurface soils at both sites. In addition, 31 mg/kg is the clean up goal for sediment. Because ingestion and inhalation of dust in Buildings S-311 and 366 at SEAD-16 contribute significantly to risk to future industrial workers, removal of debris from these buildings to decrease hazardous dust particles causing unacceptable risk is warranted. There is no chemical-specific clean up goal for the buildings, however, confirmatory sampling is included in the remedial alternatives to ensure that removal is effective in reducing risk to acceptable levels in the buildings.

Tables 2-1 and 2-2 summarize the remedial action objectives and clean up goals. A detailed discussion of these goals and the resulting degree of risk reduction is presented in Section 2.4.

## $2.3$ **RESPONSE ACTIONS**

This section presents the general response actions that have been considered applicable at SEAD-16 and 17. These actions will be used to identify specific remedial technologies that would achieve the RAOs described in previous sections.

Based upon the characteristics of the waste and the site conditions determined during the RI, the appropriateness of an action is based upon effectiveness, implementabilty and cost. Appropriate response actions are those actions that involve control of inorganics in soil and sediment. Controlling the inorganics will assure that exposure to humans and ecological receptors are prevented and will accomplish the remedial action goals for soil and sediments. Since groundwater, surface water and air are not media of concern, general response actions for these media other than prevention of further degradation of the quality of these media have not been considered. Unlike actions for organics compounds, response actions for inorganic constituents do not involve breaking down the components via a treatment process to a less innocuous substance. Instead, the actions that are appropriate for metals are those that prevent exposure by isolation, such as within a landfill, or by chemically or physically binding the metals into a stabilized matrix. In some cases, if site conditions are favorable, it is possible to accomplish this in-situ, otherwise some excavation and consolidation of materials from disperse locations will be required prior to isolation or treatment.

The screening process has identified the following general response actions as applicable for site remediation at both SEAD-16 and 17:

- No Action,
- **Institutional Control Actions,**
- **Containment Actions.**
- **In-situ Treatment Actions,**
- Excavation/Removal/Ex-situ Treatment Actions and
- Excavation/Removal/Disposal Actions.

A brief synopsis of the screening process and the reasons for selecting these general response actions is provided.

No Action involves leaving the site in the current conditions and allowing unrestricted use of the property. This action does not involve additional monitoring, security or any measures to minimize the risk to ecological receptors or human health. Since No Action does not involve

any remedial action, there are no remedial technologies or process options that are applicable. This action has been retained for further consideration because it will provide a baseline for comparing the benefits of implementing other actions. This action will not reduce human or ecological risks.

Institutional control actions represent the lowest level of response activity and consists of monitoring, security, physical restrictions such as fencing, and land use restrictions such as deed restrictions. Institutional control actions minimize the possibility of receptor contact with wastes by removing the receptor or modifying the exposure pathway. Since institutional control actions are only applicable to the receptor, they do not involve reductions in the volume, toxicity or control of wastes at the site, and would not reduce risk to ecological receptors.

Unlike many CERCLA sites that are abandoned, SEAD-16 and 17 located within the boundaries of the an active military installation. Consequently, land use is restricted to authorized personnel. Security measures are currently in place that prevent unauthorized use of the site. In addition, there are institutional controls currently in-place that require the Army to disclose the conditions of the site and restrict land use, as appropriate, to meet the risks associated with the future use of the site. These requirements include: CERCLA, 42 United States Code Section 120 (h)(1), as amended by the Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) (Public Law 102-426), which requires that any prospective owner of a site regulated under CERCLA must be notified that hazardous substances were stored and Army Regulation; and AR 200-1, paragraph 12-5, which requires that the Army must perform an Environmental Baseline Study (EBS) prior to the transfer of any Army property and must provide disclosure to the potential owner of all the potential hazards. The EBS follows similar processes required under CERCLA and includes an assessment of the risks associated with the use of the property to be transferred. These regulations are intended to assure that agreements between the Army and prospective property owners have considered the risks associated with future land use. Deed restrictions as part of an agreement for the transfer of property are actions that will allow limited, yet productive, use of the property.

The risk analysis is essential in determining what exposure scenarios are allowable for future land uses. It can be used as a basis for a land use restriction in the property deed or, if the exposure scenario indicates unacceptable risk in one portion of a parcel, then that portion can be restricted for use by limiting access via a physical barrier, security or other means. In general, some form of monitoring will be associated with this action to assure that the conditions remain constant. However, land use restrictions will not reduce ecological risk.

Containment actions are applicable to source control actions by restricting the movement or migrations of waste materials and minimizing potential impacts to receptors. These actions involve placement of a physical barrier that may include both horizontal and vertical barriers to isolate the waste materials. Some consolidation of materials may be required to minimize the area that will require isolation. The range of containment technologies include capping, slurry walls, sheet pilings or horizontal barriers using the block displacement method of grouting. Since these actions do not involve volume or toxicity reductions they will require a monitoring program to assure the integrity of the action.

In-situ treatment actions have been identified as applicable general response actions. This effort generally involves either in-situ mixing the waste with an agent preventing further migration or could include in-situ heating of the waste/soil matrix until vitrification is achieved. In either case, the soil/waste matrix is transformed into a stabilized, non-leaching, mass, without excavation. Vendors with specialized equipment are required to achieve the proper mixing with solidification agents or the high temperatures required to achieve vitrification.

Removal of debris and cleaning of Buildings S-311 and 366 at SEAD-16 are applicable as source control actions to reduce unacceptable risks from indoor dust and air. These actions would involve removal of all excess and unnecessary materials from both buildings. Cleaning procedures range from simple actions such as sweeping or high pressure wash to more complex solutions such as sand blasting or frozen  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  decontamination. These actions are evaluated in the next section. Confirmation testing will be required to ensure the effectiveness of the applied action. Removal of debris will be conducted in conjunction with excavation activities.

General response actions that involve excavation followed by treatment using either solidification/stabilization or soil washing techniques was also identified as applicable. These actions involve technologies that treat the waste/soil matrix in a treatment train. This train involves unit operations combined in a manner that produces the desired affect, be it solidification via mixing with an appropriate admixture, volume reduction via soil washing or acid leaching.

Another action that was considered viable for consideration at this facility is excavation followed by disposal in a landfill. The landfill can be either an off-site facility or a facility that will be constructed on-site. Under such an action, waste materials will be excavated, placed in the landfill and monitored. If a landfill facility were to be constructed on-site, a facility siting study will be required to assure compliance with the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 360.

November 1997

Page 2-14 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc

## $2.4$ **ESTIMATE OF QUANTITIES TO BE REMEDIATED**

The amount of material that will require a remedial action has been estimated by considering how various volume scenarios, i.e. cases, will meet the remedial action objectives. As part of this effort, Parsons ES has quantified the reduction in risk, for both non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic. The remedial action objectives involve reducing the concentration of the on-site soil and sediment to the clean-up levels in Tables 2-1 and 2-2.

The data analysis has been structured to consider a logical progression of adding material to be remediated until the final goal is achieved. This analysis has determined the volume of soil requiring a remedial action as well as the corresponding reductions in risk and lead levels achieved by removing this volume of soil. Additionally, the analysis includes the indoor building area to be remediated and the corresponding reduction in risk. As a consequence to meeting the remedial action objectives that are based primarily on lead, other compounds not specifically identified as part of the remedial action objectives are also reduced. The most significant contributor of carcinogenic risk in soil is the class of semivolatile organic compounds called Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH)s. Several of these compounds, identified by EPA as carcinogens, have been detected in the on-site surface soil samples. The presence of these compounds are not unexpected since PAHs are produced as Products of Incomplete Combustion (PIC)s. It is known that the processes performed at SEAD-16 and 17 burning of munitions and therefore it is likely that this process resulted in the formation of these residual burning products. The data is also consistent with the conceptual site model which predicted the occurrence of compounds as predominately a surface phenomenon. In all cases, the samples which contained the highest concentrations of these compounds were collected in the surface soil to the site buildings where the burning occurred.

The most significant contributors to the non-carcinogenic risk in the risk assessment are the metals, such as Ba, Cu and Zn. The risk analysis indicates that the non-carcinogenic risk levels are below the EPA target value of a HI less than 1 for current land use exposure scenarios considered. However, the risk levels are above the EPA target value for future land use scenarios at SEAD-16. An analysis of the effects of remediation on risk reduction is presented in Tables 2-3 and 2-4. This analysis provides an indication of the additional reductions in the noncarcinogenic risk produced by each case.

## **SEAD-16**

Four cases have been considered in determining the areas and volume of material that will require remedial attention. Three of these scenarios are based upon a logical progression of

November 1997

Page 2-15 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc

Seneca Army Depot Activity<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY TABLE 2-3a

## CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>READ-16 ALTERNATIVE CASES FOR SOIL REMEDIATION RISK ASSESSMENT<br>SEAD-16 ALTERNATIVE CASES FOR SOIL REMEDIATION RISK ASSESSMENT



Note: Values in boldface exceed the USEPA defined targets

TABLE 2-3b<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

## **CALCULATION OF TOTALCARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**<br>SEAD-16 ALTERNATIVE CASES FOR SOIL REMEDIATION RISK ASSESSMENT



Note: Values in boldface exceed the USEPA defined targets

CASE1-4.WK4

11/05/97

TABLE 2-4a<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

# **CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 ALTERNATIVE CASES FOR SOIL REMEDIATION RISK ASSESSMENT**



CASE1-4.WK4

TABLE 2-4b<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

# **CALCULATION OF TOTAL CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 ALTERNATIVE CASES FOR SOIL REMEDIATION RISK ASSESSMENT**



CASE1-4.WK4

increasing soil volumes and are provided on Table 2-1 and shown in Figure 2-1. The first case is only relevant to Buildings S-311 and 366 and does not consider soils. Cases 2 through 4 add soil remediation scenarios. As shown in Table 2-9, as the building debris and soil volumes associated with the various remedial strategies depicted as Cases 1 through Case 4 are removed. The non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic risks are reduced. As shown on Table 2-3A, all cases must be carried out to reduce the non-carcinogenic risk to acceptable levels.

Case 1 includes contaminated building materials and debris from abandoned Buildings S-311 and 266 at SEAD-16. The contaminated materials in the buildings are identified in the RI include soil piles and soil/sludge covering concrete floors, shell casings, filter drums, ash residues in the furnace area, and miscellaneous construction debris. The volume of material to be removed is estimated to be approximately 100 CY based on visual inspections during field investigations. It is assumed that when the contaminated materials and debris are removed from the buildings, the hazardous components in dust and indoor air will also be removed. Confirmation sampling inside the buildings will confirm this assumption. The resulting decrease in risk to future industrial workers from Case 1 is shown on Table 2-3.

Case 2 includes surface soil volume, which have lead concentrations greater than 500 mg/kg. The location of these areas are shown on Figure 2-1 and described on Table 2-1. The volume removed is approximately 675 CY of soil. Removal of Case 2 soils will result in a maximum lead concentration of 460 mg/kg for on-site soils, which is below the clean up goal of 500 mg/kg for human health protection.

Case 3 includes the soil volume from Cases 2 and building remediation from Case 1, plus sediments which have lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg. The areas are shown on Figure 2-1 and are described in Table 2-1. The sediments will be removed to a depth of 6" in the drainage swales where the samples were collected to 50 feet downgradient as well as sediments upgradient that come from SEAD-16. The cumulative total volume to be remediated for Case 3 is approximately 1,153 CY of material. The maximum lead concentration for on-site soils remains at 44 mg/kg. Table 2-3 indicates the decrease in non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic risk.

Case 4 adds subsurface soils with lead concentrations above 500 mg/kg to the Cases 2 and 3 soil volumes and the building remediation from Case 1. The areas are depicted on Figure 2-1 and are described in Table 2-1. The cumulative total volume to be remediated for Case 4 is approximately 1,262 CY of material. The maximum lead concentration is decreased to 21.4

November 1997

Page 2-20 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc



 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{S}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{S}^{(2)}_{\mathcal{S}}$ 



mg/kg. In addition, the concentrations of the metals barium, copper, and zinc are reduced. The decrease in non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic risk is presented on Table 2-3.

## SEAD-17

Three cases have been considered in determining the areas and volume of material that will require remedial attention. These scenarios are based upon a logical progression of increasing soil volumes and are provided on Table 2-2 and shown in Figure 2-2. The impacts of Cases 1 to 3 upon the carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic risk values are presented in Table 2-4.

Case 1 includes surface soil volume, which have lead concentrations greater than 500 mg/kg. The location of these areas are shown on Figure 2-2 and described on Table 2-2. The total cumulative volume removed is approximately 842 CY of soil. Removal of Case 1 soils will result in a maximum lead concentration of 460 mg/kg for on-site soils, which is below the clean up goal of 500 mg/kg for human health protection.

Case 2 includes the soil volume from Cases 1 and 2 plus sediments which have lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg. The areas are shown on Figure 2-2 and are described in Table 2-2. The sediments will be removed to a depth of 6" in the drainage swales where the samples were collected to 50 feet downgradient as well as sediments upgradient that come from SEAD-16. The cumulative total volume to be remediated for Case 3 is approximately 1,379 CY of material. The maximum lead concentration for on-site soils remains at 44 mg/kg. Table 2-4 indicates the decrease in non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic risk.

Case 3 adds subsurface soils with lead concentrations above 500 mg/kg to the Cases 1 and 2 soil volumes. The areas are depicted on Figure 2-2 and are described in Table 2-2. The cumulative total volume to be remediated for Case 4 is approximately 1,434 CY of material. The maximum lead concentration is decreased to 21.4 mg/kg. In addition, the concentrations of the metals barium, copper, and zinc were reduced. The decrease in non-carcinogenic and carcinogenic risk is presented on Table 2-4.

## $2.5$ **IDENTIFICATION AND SCREENING OF TECHNOLOGIES**

This section describes identification and initial screening of technologies. Detailed screening of alternatives is discussed in Section 3.0.



- 8  $\label{eq:1.1} \mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 



## $2.5.1$ **Identification of Technologies**

Remedial action technologies and processes have been identified for consideration as possible remediation options for clean-up of soil and sediment at SEAD-16 and 17. The list of technologies and processes presented was developed from several sources as follows:

- Standard engineering handbooks,
- Remediation equipment and service vendors,
- Engineering experience in remedial actions,
- EPA references including but not limited to:
	- "Technology Screening Guide for Treatment of CERCLA Soils and Sludges " (EPA 1988),
	- "Handbook on In Situ Treatment of Hazardous Waste Contaminated Soils" (EPA 1990),
	- "Handbook for Stabilization/Solidification of Hazardous Waste (EPA 1986).
	- "Handbook on Remediation of Contaminated Sediments" (EPA 1991a),
	- "The Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE) Program" (EPA 1992a) and
	- "Vendor Information System for Innovative Treatment Technologies (VISITT)" (EPA 1993)
	- "Alternative Treatment Technology Information Center (ATTIC) Database"

Table 2-5 presents remedial action technologies arranged according to categories for general response actions for remediation of soil/sediment. The process operations and a description of the technology is also presented. The decision to retain a technology is summarized in the screening comments portion of the table. Those technologies that have been shaded have been removed from consideration, however, each technology is briefly described in the following section.

## $2.5.2$ **Screening of Technologies**

Technology screening considers only the technical implementability of a process. Technical implementability involves an evaluation of the waste characteristics that would limit the effectiveness or feasibility of technology, and the site characteristics, such as the depth of the water table, that would preclude the use of a technology.

Screening was based on the following criteria:

Page 2-24 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc

TABLE 2-5<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT

SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17<br>TECHNOLOGY SCREENING



Note: Shaded alternatives have been screened out; non-shaded alternatives have been retained for further evaluation.

h:\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2-5.XLS

11/6/97

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{TABLE 2-5} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASBILITY STUDY} \\ \text{SENECA ARMY DEPOT} \end{array}$ 

## SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17<br>TECHNOLOGY SCREENING

ö,



Note: Shaded alternatives have been screened out; non-shaded alternatives have been retained for further evaluation.

h:\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2-5.XLS



## SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17<br>TECHNOLOGY SCREENING



Note: Shaded alternatives have been screened out; non-shaded alternatives have been retained for further evaluation.

h:\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2-5.XLS

11/6/97

TAb.LE 2-5<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT

SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17<br>TECHNOLOGY SCREENING

 $\bar{\bar{t}}$ 

 $\overline{z}$ 



Note: Shaded alternatives have been screened out; non-shaded alternatives have been retained for further evaluation.

h:\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2-5.XLS



l.

## SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17<br>TECHNOLOGY SCREENING



Note: Shaded alternatives have been screened out; non-shaded alternatives have been retained for further evaluation.

h:\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2-5.XLS

 $\bar{a}$ 

11/6/97



 $\begin{array}{c} \text{TAo.f. 2-5} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASBLLTY STUDY} \\ \text{SENECA ARMY DEPOT} \end{array}$ 

 $\sim$ 

Note: Shaded alternatives have been screened out; non-shaded alternatives have been retained for further evaluation.

h:\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2-5.XLS

11/6/97

- The technology must be reliable, based either on successful implementation at other hazardous waste sites or in comparable bench- or lab-scale applications.
- The technology must be technically applicable to site conditions and waste characteristics at SEAD-16 and SEAD-17.

General response actions, technology types, and process options that did not meet all of the foregoing criteria were excluded from further consideration.

For SEAD-16 and 17 the following remedial technologies were retained for further evaluation:

- No Action
- Containment
- Solidification/Stabilization
- Excavation/Disposal
- Soil Washing

The following sections summarize all the technologies considered and the rationale for retaining or screening out each response.

## $2.5.2.1$ **No Action**

The No Action response will result in leaving waste on-site and the soil source areas intact. This remedial action will not meet the RAOs for the site however, this alternative provides a baseline against which other alternatives can be compared. Access and direct contact with soil and sediment will continue. A No Action response for the soil allows for the continued release of suspended and dissolved materials into surface water. Since surface water and groundwater are not significantly impacted by contaminated materials, the No Action response is appropriate for these media, particularly since the site groundwater is not used as a drinking water source. However, protection against future impacts to these resources is also appropriate. This response does not address the potential future releases of materials to groundwater or surface water.

## **Institutional Control Technologies**  $2.5.2.2$

Institutional control technologies that have been considered include:

- Access Controls, such as fencing,
- Land use restrictions, such as modifications to the deed,
- Monitoring of soil and/or groundwater or

Alternative water supply.

Institutional control technologies are only applicable to the receptor and do not involve reductions in the volume, toxicity or control of wastes at the site and do not meet the RAOs. Physical barriers that restrict access to the site are feasible and effective in preventing humans from becoming exposed to on-site impacts. However, since there is a potential for contaminants to migrate off-site via surface water and sediment loading, this technology has been retained but incorporated for use with other responses. Further, wildlife, such as migrating birds, will still have access to the site and will not be protected.

Land use restrictions, such as deed modifications, are also feasible and effective in restricting exposure to humans, particularly due to residential development. However, as with access controls, deed modifications do not protect the ecological community nor is the groundwater protected. In addition, the BRAC process has already designated SEAD-16 and 17 for industrial uses, therefore deed restrictions are not applicable. As a result, this technology has been eliminated from further consideration.

Providing an alternative water supply to affected populations is also technically feasible and effective when implemented but in this instance this technology is unnecessary since the on-site groundwater is not a source of potable water. This technology was considered for competeness, since off-site residences adjacent to SEAD-16 and SEAD-17 do obtain water from private wells. However, there is no concern regarding the impacts to the off-site wells.

Some technologies by themselves such as access control will not meet the RAOs for the site, however, these technologies may be appropriate as part of other alternatives. Monitoring is another example of such a technology that will not meet the RAOs but can be used in conjunction with almost any other technology to form a viable alternative, and therefore monitoring has been retained.

## 2.5.2.3 **Containment Technologies**

Containment technologies entail securing existing soil source areas and include: capping, horizontal barriers and vertical barriers. Caps are shells that cover buried waste materials to prevent their contact with the land surface and groundwater. Caps can be impermeable to restrict mixing of infiltration with buried waste, eliminating leachate generation. Vertical barriers, such as slurry walls, are used to surround the waste to limit flow to or from the waste horizontally. Horizontal barriers, such as block displacement, are installed below the waste to stop flow vertically through the waste. On-site technologies, such as containment, pose less of a risk to on-

site workers than technologies requiring excavation because there is less opportunity for the spread of the constituents of concern and exposure.

Long-term maintenance of any containment technology will be necessary to ensure its effectiveness. For example, capping technologies include surface water run-on/runoff controls, cap inspection and repair, and collection and treatment of any gases. This response is aimed at preventing exposure to soils via direct contact and precluding migration of by dust generation, surface runoff, and leaching. It does not totally prevent migration into underlying groundwater. but it does reduce this migration because of the decrease in precipitation infiltration or flow through of groundwater. This response is generally preferred when removal of source areas are not advisable or feasible. Containment does not satisfy the preference for permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies as set forth in SARA.

## Capping

Capping is a feasible technology that involves placing a barrier over the impacted soils. The area considered for capping would likely be the total site area at either SEAD-16 or SEAD-17, since it would be impractical to cap only the localized areas that are of interest. However, consolidation of some disperse areas would be advantageous by minimizing the size and area to be capped. This option would likely require regrading of the site for proper runoff/run-on control. Clean fill borrow materials would be required in order to achieve the proper grade for capping and provide a cushion for the placement of the cap. The regraded and borrow materials would also be compacted to obtain the proper density, thereby avoiding irregularities in the cap due to uneven settlement. Sediments from the drainage swales would likely be removed and consolidated under the capped area.

Three types of caps were considered in this evaluation. These include caps comprised of :

- Soil,
- Clay and,
- Synthetic Membranes,

A soil cap would involve covering the previously prepared and graded areas to be remediated with soil of sufficient thickness and quality in order to promote a grass cover. The cap would control the exposure from inhalation of soil dust, prevent runoff of impacted particles and prevent exposure to humans and ecological receptors due to ingestion of metals in soil. However, the use of the cap alone would not be effective in reducing potential leaching to groundwater, although the cap would prevent infiltration.

November 1997

Page 2-28 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc The second option for capping would involve placing an impermeable cap below a soil cover. The impermeable material could be either clay, a bentonite admixture or a synthetic material such as High Density Polyethylene (HDPE). Caps that include the use of synthetics are referred to as multimedia caps since they involve combining the use of natural soil materials, such as sand and loam, for use as base materials, drainage layers and protective covers with impermeable synthetic membranes. Slope stability is a factor that must be considered when planning a cap, especially if membranes are being considered. This is due to the low friction factors that occur between the natural soils and the membrane surface. However, recent developments in the manufacturing of membranes have allowed vendors to provide membranes that have rough membrane surfaces, allowing for the use of membranes on steeper slopes. Impermeable caps are preferred over a soil cap because impermeable caps more effective in eliminating infiltration of precipitation. As a result, the soil cap option was eliminated from consideration. However, the remaining two caps, clay and synthetic membranes, were retained for combination as alternatives.

## **Vertical Barriers**

Vertical barriers involve preventing interaction between groundwater and buried wastes by placing surrounding the waste materials with an impermeable vertical wall. Three process operations for vertical walls were considered and include:

- Steel Sheet Pilings,
- Slurry Walls and  $\bullet$
- Grout Curtains.

Steel sheet piling are commonly used in construction projects to support a soil slope during excavation. The steel sheets are typically driven into the subsurface using specialized heavy equipment. The steel sheets are interlocking allowing for a continuous barrier around an area. At the proper depth the soil within the steel sheeted area is excavated. For excavations below the water table, pumps are required to remove any infiltrating groundwater as the interlocking sheets are not water-tight joints.

Slurry walls involves installing a trench filled with low permeable materials, such as cement and bentonite, below the water table and around the area to be isolated. Like steel sheet piling, slurry walls are commonly used in construction projects to provide lateral support during deep excavations but unlike sheet piling, slurry walls can be constructed in such a way that the wall

provides an impermeable seal against the inflow of water. The installation of the wall involves specialized equipment that involves proper mixing and injection of the slurry as the soil is removed and is normally "keyed" into an impermeable soil or bedrock zone. Leakage occurs due to flow through these zones into the isolated areas. Slurry walls can be used to capture of contain the groundwater that has mixed with buried wastes and prevent continued mixing with clean groundwater, providing the bottom of the wall is anchored in an impermeable zone.

Soil-bentonite walls are composed of soil materials mixed with bentonite and generally provides a lower permeability and compatibility to a wider range of wastes that other containment barrier types. Although soil-bentonite slurry wall construction requires a large work area for mixing and is restricted to relatively flat topography, the OB Grounds is amenable to these stipulations.

Cement-bentonite slurry walls are constructed in a manner similar to soil-bentonite slurry walls. except portland cement is mixed with the bentonite instead of soil. These walls are adaptable to more extreme topography and do not require an extensive mixing work area. Cement-bentonite walls provide more structural strength than soil-bentonite wall, however, they are typically more permeable and less chemical resistant.

Grouting is the practice of injecting, under pressure, a fluid, such as cement, cement-bentonite or a chemical grout, into soil or rock to decrease the soil/rock permeability and/or strengthen the formation. Grout curtains have been used in the construction industry for several decades, but their application to source isolation form groundwater has not been practiced as frequently as slurry walls. An inherent drawback of grouting is the indefinite extent and integrity of the final grout curtain that is created.

Vertical barriers involve preventing interaction between groundwater and buried wastes by placing surrounding the waste materials with an impermeable vertical wall. Three process operations for vertical walls were considered and include:

- Steel Sheet Pilings,
- Slurry Walls and
- Grout Curtains.

Of the three vertical technologies considered, none were retained for combination as a remedial alternative since vertical barriers will not meet RAOs for protecting human health and the environment from lead in surface soils.
# **Horizontal Barriers**

In instances where it is not feasible to install a barrier such as a liner prior to placing the wastes requiring isolation it is possible to install a horizontal barrier in-situ under the wastes. This is usually required due to unacceptable leakage and mixing of groundwater with buried wastes and is most applicable where unweathered bedrock or some other impermeable strata are not sufficiently near the surface for a vertical barrier to sufficiently isolate and contain the waste. Horizontal barriers involve injecting impermeable materials below the buried materials. Two process operations were considered. These include :

- Grout Injection and
- **Block Displacement.**

Grout injection techniques involve pressure injecting cement, cement-bentonite or a chemical grout into soil or rock to strengthen and decrease the permeability of the formation. The grout is forced into the void spaces of the soil, forming a solidified zone of soil and grout in the area of injection. Through a sufficient number of overlapping injection points, an impermeable seal is created below the waste materials. This process works best if the grout is injected through permeable formations such as sands that will allow the grout to cover a larger area. Excessive injection pressures are required for dense strata, such as glacial till, that are not particularly permeable. Once injected over an area, the grout would act as a bottom seal preventing interactions between the waste that would be buried below the water table and groundwater.

The block displacement method is another technique for the in-situ horizontal isolation of waste. This technique involves placing a barrier around the sides as well as underneath the contaminated ground and vertically displacing the enclosed earth mass or block. The barrier is formed by pumping slurry into a series of notched injection holes. Continued pumping of the slurry under low pressures produces a large uplift force against the bottom of the block an results in vertical displacement proportional to the volume of the slurry pumped. This technique has not been used in full-scale application but has been demonstrated on a small scale. During the demonstrations, problems were encountered with maintaining adequate injection hole pressures and with perimeter separation (drill, notch and blast) technique. The technology is best suited to a site where a natural impermeable bottom barrier does not exist sufficiently near the surface for a vertical perimeter barrier to act alone as an isolation technique.

Horizontal barrier techniques were eliminated from further consideration since unweathered bedrock is sufficiently near to the surface that the bedrock would act as a horizontal barrier if combined with a vertical barrier to prevent mixing of groundwater with buried waste. In

addition, the soil layers at SEAD-16 and SEAD-17 are thin and injection of grout would produce breakout of the grout along the thin soil zone. This would prevent the injected grout from forming a continuous barrier over the entire area.

### **In-Situ Treatment Technologies** 2.5.2.4

The in-situ treatment technologies involve control of soil source areas to be treated in-place. Insitu treatment immobilizes, separates, degrades, detoxifies, or destroys contaminants without the added cost of excavation, materials handling or treatment equipment. In-situ treatment is advantageous as it does not involve construction of a treatment facility and limits the exposure of treatment operators to contaminated soils. Treatment of soils in-place is most appropriate when the nature and extent of the source areas are well defined, the sources are homogeneous, the surrounding hydrogeology is well defined, and soil permeability's are suitable for in-situ Treatment process operations generally entails soil modification via either the treatment. injection of air, water, or chemical reagents into the soil or application of an electric current causing either vitrification or migration of metal ions. In-situ treatments are classified generally as innovative or advanced technologies. This means they require more pilot testing prior to design and implementation, and more monitoring during implementation compared to The primary difficulties associated with in-situ treatment conventional technologies. applications are the inability to control the environment under which the process occurs; the inability to ensure contact between treatment reagents (i.e., heat, microorganisms, air, water, or chemical contaminants in the source areas); the difficulty of maintaining effectiveness with depth; and the possibility that toxic byproducts may be released. However, in-situ treatment applications are potentially preferable over on-site or off-site treatment because waste excavation and corresponding site restoration activities are not required, and minimal disruption of hazardous constituents occurs.

The following in-situ treatment technologies were considered as potential remedial alternatives :

- Solidification Technologies
	- Cement-based Immobilization/Fixation
- Vitrification,
- **Electrical Extraction Technology**  $\bullet$ 
	- Electrokinetics,
- **Chemical Extraction Technology** 
	- Soil Flushing,
- **Biological Extraction Technologies** 
	- Bioventing/Biostimulation,

- Vegetative Uptake,
- Vapor Extraction Technologies
	- Vacuum Extraction and
	- Radiowave Enhanced Volatilization.

The applicability of each in-situ technology to this site is discussed below:

# Solidification/Stabilization

Solidification is similar to process of installing vertical barriers except that the intent is to convert an area into a monolithic mass of soil and cementous material. The operation involves pressure injecting an appropriate cement-based admixture while soil is turned using large augers. This process is repeated until the area of interest has been completely mixed. As the soil/cement cure, the waste materials are incorporated into the cement matrix and prevented from further leaching or from exposure to receptors. Soil above and below the water table can be mixed in this manner. Limitations as to the depth of efficient mixing is a function of the type and power of equipment used. Large rocks/cobbles and dense soil conditions can provide difficulty in turning the soil due to binding of the augers and the large power requirements. To achieve successful mixing involves the use of large, highly specialized equipment capable of providing sufficient torque to turn the soil at depth. As the augers mix the soil, cement is injected through the center of the auger and into the subsurface through ports, located at the auger tip. This ensures adequate mixing of the cement and the soil. This technique was demonstrated by IWT Corp. and Geo-Con, Inc. at a Superfund site in Hialeah Florida in 1989 as part of the SITE program. IWT Corp developed the solidifying/stabilization agent and Geo-Con, Inc. provided the waste mixing technology. The operation successfully produced a stable, high strength, cementous mass in the soil that was shown to be low permeability and non-leaching for metals and PCBs. A similar process would be technically feasible at either SEAD-16 or SEAD-17. In this instance, the pads and berms would be mixed with the cementous admixture using augers until the appropriate level of treatment was achieved.

In-situ vitrification (ISV) involves applying a large voltage, as much as  $4,160$  V, between molybdenum or graphite electrodes installed and arranged in a grid pattern, usually square, into the soil. A conductive mixture of flaked graphite and glass frit is placed in an X pattern among the electrodes in 5 cm deep trenches to initiate electrical conductance. The application of the large voltage cause a current to develop in the soil matrix. As a result, the soil is heated due to the electrical resistance that occurs between the electrodes. As the soil melts the soil becomes electrically conductive causing the melting process to perpetuate down the soil column. During the soil temperature rise, soil moisture is boiled away and organic matter is destroyed, until

November 1997

Page 2-33 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc temperatures of approximately 2000<sup>°</sup>F are reached. At these high temperatures, the soil begins to melt, essentially becoming a glass-like mass. As the vitrified melt is allowed to cool, the mass becomes solidified, entombing the waste materials. Due to the large amount of off-gassing that occurs in this process, many of which are toxic, a cover is typically placed over the soil as it is heated to collect and treat the gases. The process is considered innovative and has been identified as an appropriate technology for application at radioactive waste sites. Full scale, widespread, operation of this technology has not been performed, probably due to the excessive power requirements that this technology requires, although pilot testing has been conducted. Geosafe Corp. successfully demonstrated this process at a site in Region V.

Electrokinetics involves converting the saturated soil to an electrochemical cell through the application of sufficient voltage to the soil electrodes. Electrodes, one an anode and the other a cathode, are installed into the soil that allow an electric current to flow in the soil. Once sufficient voltage is applied, the soil is essentially transformed into an electrochemical cell. As in any cell, dissolved soil anions and cations migrate to the appropriate electrode. Metallic cations migrate to the negatively charged electrode, the anode, where the metals are removed as the cations plate out.

Electrokinetics is possible but is only capable of removing dissolved metals in the saturated soil. Since much of the metals at the site are located above the water table as solid particles, this technology was screened out from further consideration.

### **Soil Flushing**

Soil flushing involves the in-situ application of water, hot water/steam, solvents, either polar or non-polar, acids or surfactants to buried waste materials with the intent of solubilizing the constituents of concern into the groundwater. This technology is typically used for extracting organic compounds from soils when excavation is not possible. The solubilizing agent along with the pollutants are then recovered from the groundwater using extraction wells. When possible, the solvent or surfactant is then separated and recovered for recycling back into the soil in order to extract additional waste material. The use of solvents to solubilize pollutants is of concern as this process has the potential to increase the pollutant loading to groundwater, if the solubilized materials are not completely recovered. In addition, as residual concentrations of this agent will permeate the subsurface, the extracting agent should be as non-toxic as possible. This restricts the number and types of flushing agents and limits the effectiveness of soil flushing process.

November 1997

Page 2-34 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc While this technology has promise at heavily contaminated sites where excavation is impractical it was eliminated from further consideration for application at SEAD-16 and 17 since this technology is most appropriate for use with sites impacts with organic compounds. The constituents of concern at SEAD-16 and 17 are inorganic compounds, lead in particular, and it is unlikely that any useable soil flushing agent would be successful at extracting the metals of interest. Further, the thin soil thicknesses and the low permeability of the groundwater suggests that the collection of the extracted materials would be slow and inefficient.

# **Bioventing Removal/Extraction**

Bioventing/Biostimulation involves adding air (oxygen) to the subsurface in order to stimulate the natural microbiological community to degrade the waste materials. The air is typically added, under pressure, through properly spaced and screened injection wells. The wells are constructed so that air is added a rate greater than what is lost due to consumption by the microorganisms and movement beyond the area of remediation. The soil microorganisms are abundant in the subsurface, many species are of the type known to degrade organic molecules, such as hydrocarbons. With maintenance of proper conditions in the subsurface, it has been shown that these organisms will effectively degrade pollutants.

Bioventing/Biostimulation is not effective for inorganic components and therefore has been eliminated from further consideration.

Recent development regarding the extraction of metals via the vegetative uptake of plants has shown promise. Studies suggest that metals and in some instances organics can be removed through the transfer of these materials into the root system of selected plants. This technology is experimental and unreliable.

Extraction of metals via the vegetative uptake of plants is experimental and unreliable. The conditions of the pads and berms at the site would not promote vegetative growth and this technology was screened from further consideration.

### Vapor Removal/Extraction

Vacuum or vapor extraction is one of the most widely applied in-situ technologies at hazardous waste sites. Several vendors are available that have successfully applied this technology. It is most applicable for recovery of volatile organics in soil. The process involves application of a vacuum to the subsurface through a well screened in the unsaturated zone. The applied vacuum is transferred to the soil pores causing increased volatilization of organics and the movement of

air to the extraction well as a result of pressure differences. A continuous air stream laden with extracted organics are removed and treated, if necessary, prior to discharge. This process continues until the soil is free of the target compounds. The technology is cost effective to apply with the cost of a blower being the only major component of the extraction system. Treatment of the off-gas can range from thermal oxidizers, if the gas concentrations are sufficiently high, to carbon adsorption, if the concentrations are low.

Vacuum or vapor extraction was screened from further consideration since the constituents of concern at this site are inorganics, making this technology ineffective.

Radiowave enhanced volatilization is a variation of vacuum extraction and involves the application of radiowaves directly to the subsurface causing the soil temperatures to rise. As the temperature of the soil increases, the vapor pressures of constituents in the soil also increase. This allows compounds that normally would not have been removed, to be removed from the soil. This technology is considered innovative and experimental with only limited pilot scale applications. It is most appropriate for sites where excavation is impractical and semi-volatile organic compounds are the constituents of concern.

Radiowave enhanced volatilization is considered innovative and experimental with only limited pilot scale applications. It is most appropriate for sites where excavation is impractical and semi-volatile organic compounds are the constituents of concern. Since lead, an inorganic compound with a boiling point of 1300 $\textdegree$ F, this technology would not be effective in removing lead from soil and was screened out from further consideration.

### 2.5.2.5 **Removal Technologies**

## Soil and Sediment

Complete or partial removal of source soils and sediments are an integral component of many remedial alternatives. This can be accomplished using standard mechanical excavation technologies or could involve methods that slurry the soil and then remove the slurry using slurry pumps. Typical heavy equipment such as backhoes, excavators, front-end loaders, scrapers, bulldozers and draglines are commonly used for the mechanical excavation of soil. For soil/sediment that is highly organic and contains a high water content, the soil/sediment is removed using a pump.

Since the soil at SEAD-16 and 17 can be easily removed using standard mechanical excavation techniques, only this technology was retained for further consideration. Excavation using slurry techniques was screened out of further consideration since it would not be as practical.

# **Building Materials at SEAD-16**

Removal at SEAD-16 includes collection of debris and other materials from abandoned Buildings S-311 and 366.

Techniques exist for cleaning and removing contaminants from concrete surfaces, such as sand blasting, high pressure washing, concrete decontamination using microwaves, soda blasting, electro-hydaulic scabbling, electrokinetic decontamination, and dry ice pellet decontamination. However, these blasting and washing processes are complex and can be costly, and some may produce waste that must be treated before disposal and may increase the potential for migration of contaminants to outside the buildings. Because the samples collected inside the building were limited to debris and floors, the application of washing and blasting techniques is not warranted. Consequently, only removal of excess material and debris, including sweeping out dust and dirt, is retained as a remedial response, and is included with soils excavation when determining the volume of materials to be removed at SEAD-16.

#### 2.5.2.6 **Ex-situ Treatment Technologies**

Ex-situ treatment technologies involves addressing source areas with above ground process unit operations within the site boundaries or could involve transporting soil to an off-site facility for treatment. It will require removal, storage and consolidation of source material.

On-site treatment in aboveground reactors entails the construction of a temporary treatment facility. This facility can be one that is fixed, requiring the assembly of modular treatment units brought to the site on trailer trucks (which can be disassembled and moved off-site upon completion of treatment), or the use of mobile treatment trailers temporarily parked on-site. Fixed facilities are costly and difficult to build and become obsolete once treatment is complete unless wastes from other sites can be shipped on-site for treatment. The current trend is toward temporary on-site treatment units, mobile, modular, or transportable, that can be removed and transported to another site for reuse.

Several treatment processes are available in mobile or modular units. This type of treatment will generally require laboratory of pilot studies using site-specific source material to determine level of performance and optimal process operating parameters. The more complex a process and the more variable the waste composition and volume, the greater the possibility of operational upsets and delays. Because of the variability of physical and chemical characteristics of the waste at the SEAD-16 and 17, the most desirable treatment schemes will be those that are simpler, less susceptible to shock loading, able to operate in batch processing modes, and capable of handling a wide range of chemical and physical constituents.

On-site treatment also will entail further responses to handle treatment of residuals, byproducts, or sidestreams. The residuals must be disposed of, although some may be nonhazardous and the volume may be only a fraction of the initial waste volume.

On-site treatment of soil source material (ex-situ) has several advantages over in-situ treatment. On-site treatment allows for the treatment of contaminated material in aboveground reactors where the process environment can be easily monitored and controlled to provide greater reliability and effectiveness for any given treatment scheme. The state-of-the-art technology for aboveground technologies are generally considered to be more advanced than it is for in-situ treatments. Processes used for sanitary, industrial, or nuclear wastes can be more easily adapted for aboveground treatment. Where excavation and handling of source material is not feasible or appropriate (i.e., where risk of exposure during handling exceeds risk associated with other alternatives), on-site treatment may not be preferred.

On-site treatment of soils is preferred over off-site treatment when the volume of soils to be transported off-site is large, incurring expensive transportation fees that outweigh the benefits of off-site treatment. In addition, off-site hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities may not have the capacity to accept all the CERCLA waste if the volume is too large. However, at SEAD-16 and 17, the volume of soil to be treated is relatively small, so that the benefits of transporting the waste off-site may outweigh the cost (Specific costs are discussed in Sections 3.0 and 5.0). However, for small volumes, on-site mobile treatment units are likely to have the volumetric capacity to treat the amount of contaminated soil at SEAD-16 and 17 in a timely manner, which would eliminate the need for off-site transport of hazardous soil.

On-site treatment of soil source material is preferable over containment or on-site disposal responses because it can provide a permanent solution to the contamination problem. However, it would not be preferable when: (a) removal is inappropriate based on screening criteria, (b) available treatments increase the volume of the material to be handled to unacceptable levels, (c) available treatments result in other environmental releases (such as air emissions) when these releases result in greater risk than other response, or (d) no suitable treatment method is available.

November 1997

Page 2-38 k:\Seneca\S16&17fs\Text\Section2.Doc Off-site treatment allows source area material to be removed completely from the site and treated at a full-scale fixed facility. Off-site treatment requires excavation, consolidation, and off-site transportation of source material. It entails identification of RCRA-permitted hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal (TSD) facilities with the capability and capacity to treat material removed from source areas. Off-site handling of source materials would require permits for transportation and disposal. This response eliminates both continued releases on-site and direct contact with source material by on-site receptors. However, given that handling of source materials occurs for this response, the potential for releases, worker exposure, or off-site exposure is possible.

Off-site treatment could be adopted for SEAD-16 and 17 by one of three approaches: (1) all contaminated source material found at the site would be transported off-site for treatment, (2) only the waste and source material that is not treatable by a selected on-site treatment technology would be transported off-site, or (3) only waste and source materials subject to the land ban would be transported off-site for treatment. The selected off-site TSD facility must be capable of treating wastes containing metals and semi-volatile organic compounds. Pretreatment may be required before shipping material off-site. This may include dewatering or removing any hazardous waste characteristics such as toxicity.

The following ex-situ treatment technology types and process options were determined to be applicable at SEAD-16 and 17 based on the screening criteria:

- **Biological Technologies** 
	- Aerobic  $\bullet$
	- Anaerobic
- Stabilization/Solidification Technologies
	- Pozzolan-portland cement
	- Pozzolan-lime-fly ash
	- Micro-encapsulation
	- Sorption
- **Physical Separation Technologies** 
	- Soil Washing
	- **Magnetic Classification**
- Thermal Oxidation/Vitrification Technologies
- **High Temperature Processes**
- Other Oxidation Technologies
	- Wet Air Oxidation

# **Biological Technologies**

Ex-situ biological treatment of soil involves degradation of contaminants that are entrained in the soil pores through the actions of microorganisms. Land treatment has been successfully utilized by the petroleum industry for many years as a cost effective way of stabilizing oily wastes produced during the refining process. Land treatment facilities are normally found in areas, near the refineries, that have large tracts of available land and are in climates that have temperatures favorable for stimulating biological growth. The above ground biological treatment methods vary and include: landfarming (land treatment), slurry bioreactors, digestors and composting. The process involves providing the proper ratio of pH, nutrients, oxygen (if aerobic conditions are required) and temperature to stimulate the natural microorganisms to utilize the organic contaminants as a source of cellular energy. Several microorganisms have been identified that can utilize petroleum hydrocarbons and other hydrocarbons as sources of energy. In addition to maintaining control of previously mentioned factors, a key factor in achieving a successful clean-up using this technology is to assure that toxic concentrations of contaminants and/or byproducts are not produced to hamper the growth rates of the microorganisms. In additional it is important to provide adequate contact between the microorganisms and the contaminants. For recalcitrant hydrocarbons, such as the Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs), slurry bioreators have been utilized to improve the contact between microorganisms and waste materials.

Ex-situ biological treatment of soil has been screened out since it is effective for soils that have been impacted with organic constituents and would not meet the objectives for reducing the concentration of lead in soil. Biological treatment would have little if any effect on the soils at SEAD-16 and 17 that are impacted with lead.

### Solidification/Stabilization

Solidification refers to techniques that encapsulate waste materials in a solid matrix that is resistant to weathering due to its structural integrity. Stabilization involves technologies that convert constituents to a less soluble or less toxic form. In general, the technology is a combination of both processes and is usually referred to as solidification/stabilization (S/S). On a microscale, constituents such as metals in an ionic form and water, are either chemically bonded to the solidification materials or are converted into an insoluble form, such as a metal hydroxide,

within the solid matrix. Particulates or solids are encapsulated in the solid matrix and prevented from migration or exposure to receptors. The most common agents that are used for S/S are cement, lime, pozzolans (siliceous) materials and fly ash. These materials are combined in various ratios to produce the most stable and non-leaching monolithic mass.

Any material or process that causes incomplete mixing or prevents the S/S matrix from forming a uniform slurry prior to properly curing will interfere with the success of the treatment effectiveness. Large materials are normally screened out prior to the mixing process to assure a uniform mixture. Materials that have a high moisture content, such as sediments, have a high oil content or are coated with oil can also contribute to ineffectiveness and poor performance of S/S during prove-out testing. The technology is not typically used for treatment of oily waste although some vendors claim the their proprietary solidification agents will treat such wastes up to 10%. Extremely dry wastes can also contribute to poor mixing and uniformity in the formation of the S/S slurry by causing lumps.

The S/S technology using a mixture of pozzolan/cement/lime/fly ash has been identified by EPA as effective and is feasible for treatment of the soils at SEAD-16 and 17. The EPA policy regarding the use of this technology indicates that it is appropriate for materials that contain inorganics and non-volatile organics. With the wide range of solidifying agents available, this technology usually requires the performance of a site-specific treatability study to determine the most effective solidifying agent and the optimal ratio of waste to admixture. Since the constituents of concern at the site are inorganics with some amounts of semi-volatile organics, such as PAHs, present, this technology meets the requirements for application at this site and was retained for further consideration.

Microencapsulation involves encapsulating a particle within a thermoplastic matrix of asphalt, polyethylene or polypropylene. This technique requires heating the plastic and mixing the waste as the plastic is extruded and cooled. The final mass incorporates the waste in a matrix that is inert to normal weathering and structurally stable.

Microencapsulation has been used primarily in the nuclear industry to encapsulate radioactive sludge's and is not considered feasible at either SEAD-16 or SEAD-17 due to the non-uniform nature of the soils and sediments that will require treatment.

Sorption is a technique that involves mixing semi-solid sludges with a dry solid adsorbent to improve the solids handling characteristics of the sludge. The sorbent material may interact chemically with the waste or may simply be wetted by the liquid, usually water or oil, as part of the waste, retaining the liquid within the matrix of the solid.

Sorption is most appropriate for use with semi-solid sludges and was eliminated from consideration a part of a remedial alternative since there are no sludges requiring treatment.

# **Physical Separation/Aqueous Extraction**

Physical separation technologies include soil washing and magnetic classification. Soil washing involves physically separating the various fraction of soil using a series of unit operations such as grizzly bars, trommel screens, flotation units, flocculation tanks and clarifiers. The process removes contaminants from soils by either dissolving or suspending them in the wash solution or by concentrating the pollutants into a smaller volume through a series of particle size separation steps. In some instances, the washing fluid, which is normally water, can be supplemented with an aqueous surfactant for improved separation. The key concept associated with soil washing is to reduce the volume of soil that will require treatment allowing for the washed soil to be returned to the site as clean backfill. This process takes advantage of the fact that, in most instances, pollutants tend to distribute into the fine fraction of soil. The wash water is typically recycled back to the washing process once it has been treated.

Magnetic classification of soils is another volume reduction process that involves the use of electromagnets to separate magnetic materials such as iron from non-magnetic materials. This is a common process used in many recycling facilities.

Soil washing is considered to be effective and feasible remedial technology for both sites and has been retained for incorporation as a remedial alternative. Magnetic classification of soils would not be effective since most of the constituents of concern are non-magnetic.

# Thermal Oxidation/Vitrification

Thermal oxidation/vitrification technologies involve heating soils/sludges in a high temperature reactor causing the solid fraction of the waste to become incorporated into either a molten metal bath or a slag. The technology has several variations depending upon the equipment and the vendor. The conditions within the bath are reducing and involve addition of hydrogen gas. Under these conditions, soils, that are comprised mostly of alumina and silica, partition into a slag phase above the molten bath and are removed as a vitrified mass when allowed to cool. The slag, now a vitrified mass is essentially an inert, non-leaching solid that can be placed into a landfill or returned to the site for disposal. Volatile metals in the waste feed, such as lead, are vaporized, oxidized in a secondary combustion chamber and recovered as a dust in a collection

system. Several vendors are available to provide this treatment including Horsehead Resource Development Company, Inc., Molten Metals and ECO Logic Inc.

Thermal oxidation/vitrification technologies are feasible, providing a vendor can be found to accept this material at an off-site location and have been retained for future consideration as part of a remedial alternative.

# **Chemical Extraction**

Chemical extraction of soils can be accomplished using materials, such as carbon dioxide or propane, that are normally gases at ambient temperatures and pressures. However, when these gases are pressurized to a liquefied state they have the capability to efficiently extract oil and other organic wastes. The process involves mixing a liquefied solvent with the solid waste material, extracting the contaminants, separating the solids from the liquefied solvent and releasing the pressure causing the liquefied solvent to vaporize back to a gas, leaving an oil. The oil is then treated further or disposed of in accordance with all pertinent regulations. Vendors, such as CF Systems, Inc. and The Institute of Gas Technology have systems that are available to provide this treatment.

Chemical extraction of soils can also involve mixing an appropriate non-aqueous chemical solvent with soil/sediments in order to remove contaminants by solubilizing the contaminants, separating the solvent from the soil/sediments and recycling the solvent. There are a variety of solvents available that can be used to extract materials and the choice of solvent is largely dependent upon the type of contaminant that is the focus of the extraction. Several vendors can provide this treatment technology with each vendor focusing on a specific extraction agent. Some of the more widely known solvents include: triethly amine (TEA), liquefied propane or liquefied carbon dioxide. The solvent TEA is used for the Basic Extraction Sludge Treatment (BEST), developed by Resources Conservation Company. In this process, soils/sludges are mixed with TEA at low temperatures. The essential feature of this technology is that it takes advantage of the large changes in the solubility of TEA and water and temperature. At temperatures less than 18°C TEA is completely miscible with oil and water. When mixed with oily soils or sludge's at or below this temperature, TEA is able to remove, by dissolution, any oily materials and the contaminants associated with the oil. The TEA/water/oil mixture is centrifuged or filtered to separate the extracted soil/sludges from the extracting fluid. The recovered solids are then dried to remove any residual TEA, which is then recovered any recycled back for continued extraction. The extracting liquid, containing TEA/oil/water, is then heated causing the TEA to become insoluble with water producing a two-phased system. The top phase contains the TEA/oil phase and is decanted off, distilled to separate and recycle the

volatile solvent TEA, leaving the extracted oil. The oil is either treated further of disposed of as a hazardous waste, recycled as a recyclable spent oil. The bottom portion of the heated liquid that was not decanted is primarily water is also distilled to remove any residual TEA and discharged.

Chemical extraction of soils are effective for extracting organics or oily waste materials but are not effective for removing inorganic constituents. Since the RAO for this project is inorganics, i.e. lead, and the soil and sediments at either SEAD-16 or SEAD-17 are not impacted with oily waste, this technology was not considered effective and was screened out.

#### 2.5.2.7 **Disposal**

### On-Site

SARA states that treatment that permanently and significantly reduces the volume, toxicity, or mobility of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants is to be preferred over remedial actions not involving treatment. On-site disposal will not address this preference unless used in an alternative that also included a technology that will reduce volume, toxicity, or mobility. Onsite disposal, therefore, includes an assumption that such a treatment technology has been applied. Treated material is backfilled as clean. Therefore, the use of on-site disposal is not precluded by the preference set forth in SARA to reduce volume, mobility or toxicity. On-site disposal of clean fill has been retained as a response to be considered.

Disposal can be at either an on-site landfill or at an off-site landfill. On-site disposal will allow source material to be secured on-site. On-site disposal may be preferable to off-site disposal because it eliminates off-site transportation of source material, which eliminates the potential for off-site spills and off-site receptor impacts. On-site disposal responses require removal and consolidation of source material into an on-site disposal facility. Excavated areas are filled and regraded.

At the site, an on-site landfill may be applicable for the containment of soils, treated to remove any RCRA characteristic, and for untreated nonhazardous wastes. The following process operations have been considered for the on-site disposal technologies :

- Backfilling of clean soil.
- RCRA hazardous waste landfill and
- Solid waste landfill.

Construction of a new on-site landfill, designed to meet RCRA and/or state standards can be constructed within the present boundaries of the depot. Consolidation of on-site waste within a future landfill is feasible and appropriate for the SEAD-16 and 17 soils. Two types of landfills have been considered, one type is an industrial type landfill, i.e a solid waste management landfill regulated under Title 6 Part 360 of the New York Codes, Rules and Regulations (NYCRR), the other type is a RCRA, Subtitle C, hazardous waste type landfill regulated under Title 6 Part 373 of the NYCRR. Both facilities would require siting studies and permitting prior to construction however, the requirements for a new RCRA hazardous waste landfill are more extensive and exhaustive. The permitting, monitoring, design and construction required to comply with all the requirements of such a facility under RCRA is not necessary for this project. The need to construct a RCRA hazardous waste landfill is only required if the wastes to be disposed of are considered to be RCRA hazardous. Wastes are hazardous if they possess the characteristics of either ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity or toxicity or if the wastes are listed by EPA as hazardous from non-specific or specific sources. In the case of SEAD-16 and 17 there are no known listed hazardous wastes to be disposed of. However, a portion of the soils at the site may exhibit the characteristic of toxicity as a result of lead concentrations exceeding the limits of the EP Toxicity test, now called the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP). If the characteristic of the waste is removed, i.e. the soil no longer exceeds the limits for toxicity due to treatment, then the waste is no longer a hazardous waste and can be landfilled in an on-site, non-hazardous, solid waste landfill.

Accordingly, the on-site solid waste landfill option and the backfilling clean treated soil have been retained for inclusion with other technologies as remedial alternatives.

# Off-Site

Off-site disposal involves source area materials to be completely removed from a site. This entails removal of source material and consolidation into containers for off-site transportation. All excavated areas must be filled and graded with clean imported fill. This technology eliminates continued on-site exposure to source materials by humans or ecological receptors. It also allows unimpaired future use of the site. However, releases and impacts may occur that could affect public health and environment at off-site locations. Off-site disposal is preferable when on-site disposal is precluded or limited by site characteristics, when unimpaired future use of the site is a high priority, and when the volume for disposal is too small to warrant construction of a landfill. Two options were considered for off-site disposal. These included:

- State-permitted RCRA hazardous waste landfill and
- State-permitted solid waste landfill.

A permitted, off-site RCRA TSD facility with the capacity and capability to handle this source material must be identified. Due to the RCRA Land Ban Restrictions (LDR), waste, if hazardous, will need to be treated prior to disposal in the facility. If the waste is a listed waste then the treated waste will still be required to be disposed of in a TSD facility. If the waste is a characteristic waste the waste will not need to be disposed of in a TSD facility once the characteristic is removed due to treatment. For SEAD-16 or 17, this means that soil that exceeds the TCLP limit for lead would be a D008 hazardous waste. However, if the soil is treated and is shown to be below the limits for toxicity as defined by the TCLP test then the soil is no longer hazardous and does not need to be disposed of in a TSD facility.

At the site, off-site disposal of waste and soils from contaminated areas is a feasible option. Since there are no wastes at SEAD-16 or SEAD-17 that are listed wastes, the need to dispose of any soil in an off-site TSD facility does not apply and has been removed from further consideration. Soil that may be characteristic by toxicity would need to be treated to remove the characteristic prior to disposal in an off-site landfill. The landfill does not need to be a hazardous waste landfill, since the waste is no longer hazardous once the characteristic has been removed.

Remedial action technologies and processes are screened on Table 2-5, based on whether a process is technically feasible and effective for remediating soils/sediment and whether it meets the remedial action objectives. As shown on **Table 2-5**, processes that are shaded have been screened out based on screening comments listed.

#### 3.0 DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES

#### $3.1$ **INTRODUCTION**

In this section the remaining general response actions and the various remaining remedial technologies are combined to form remedial alternatives. The rationale is presented for how and why the selected technologies were assembled into remedial action alternatives. Only source control alternatives and the technologies that comprise them are described. Alternatives for remediation of groundwater and surface water are not part of the RAOs for this site and are not considered, other than protecting these resources from any degradation.

Once the alternatives have been assembled, the alternatives are evaluated with respect to three broad remedial alternatives screening criteria: effectiveness, implementability and cost. A brief description of the screening criteria is provided:

> Effectiveness is a key aspect of the screening process as each alternative must be capable in meeting the requirements established as RAOs for this site. In this instance, the RAOs define the required degree of protectiveness for human health and the environment. A remedial action alternative is considered effective, and therefore protective, if the alternative can reduce the toxicity, mobility or volume to the level identified by the RAOs. Both short and long term components of protectiveness were considered. Short term protectiveness refers to the construction and implementation period. Long term protectiveness refers to changes that can be expected in the characteristics of the constituents of concern that have been treated.

> Implementability is a measure of both the technical and administrative feasibility of constructing, operating and maintaining a remedial action alternative. Technical feasibility refers to the ability to construct, reliably operate, and meet technologyspecific regulations for process options until a remedial action is complete; it also includes maintenance, replacement, and monitoring the technical components of an alternative during and after the remedial action is complete. Administrative feasibility refers to the availability of treatment, storage, and disposal services and capacity; and the requirements for and availability of specific equipment and technical specialists.

Cost estimations during screening is required as a comparative measure of the costs for a remedial action. The level of accuracy for cost estimates required at this point is similar to that required for the detailed analysis and is considered to be +50% to -30%. The only difference would be in the amount of alternative refinement and in the degree that the cost components are developed. Both capital and O&M costs were considered, where appropriate. The evaluation included O&M costs that would be incurred for up to 30 years. Present worth analyses were used during the alternative screening to evaluate expenditures over different time periods in order to provide a common basis to compare costs.

Six alternatives (five plus the no action alternative) were assembled and screened for soil and sediment based on these three criteria. The initial alternatives list of six were then reduced to four alternatives that were analyzed in detail in Section 5.0.

### $3.2$ **ASSEMBLY OF ALTERNATIVES**

In this section the rationale is presented for assembling technologies and processes remaining from the technology screening into remedial action alternatives. These retained technologies and processes, summarized on Table 2-5, are representative of the general response actions that were retained. The general response actions and technologies associated with these actions have been combined as remedial alternatives and are listed in order of increasing complexity. An innovative technology has been included to comply with the SARA (1986) requirement that alternative solutions be used to the maximum extent possible. The alternatives that have been assembled from the remaining general response actions and associated technologies for soil and sediment at SEAD-16 and SEAD-17 are as follows:

- Alternative 1 No Action,
- Alternative 2 On-site Containment.
- Alternative 3 In-situ Treatment,
- Alternative 4 Off-Site Disposal,
- Alternative 5 On-Site Disposal,

Alternative 6 - Ex-Situ (Innovative) Treatment.  $\bullet$ 

A brief description of the alternatives, the technologies and processes associated with these actions are assembled, summarized, and presented on Table 3-1.

### 3.3 DESCRIPTION OF TECHNOLOGIES, PROCESSES AND **ALTERNATIVES**

#### 3.3.1 **General**

Up until this point remedial response actions, technologies and processes have been evaluated in general. The generality is necessary in order to consider the large number of possible remedial actions that may be appropriate; however, because the alternatives retained are relatively similar it is now necessary to define the project in more detail to better distinguish, evaluate and screen the assembled alternatives for a detailed alternatives evaluation that will be performed in Section 5.0.

The technologies and processes that make up the six assembled alternatives for soil, sediment, and the Buildings S-311 and 366 at SEAD-16 will be described in sufficiently greater detail to allow each assembled alternative to be screened. In addition to better defining technologies and processes, the quantity of material to be remediated has also been considered. Order of magnitude unit costs have been developed based on technology definitions and material quantities. These costs were then utilized as one of the alternatives screening criteria. It is important to note that the final decision regarding specific remedial technologies and processes to be utilized may be dependent on the results of treatability studies proposed in Section 4.0.

### 3.3.2 **Remedial Alternatives**

### 3.3.2.1 **Alternative 1 - No Action**

Alternative 1 is the No Action alternative. This alternative allows the site to remain as it currently is, with no further consideration given to any remedial actions.

#### 3.3.2.2 **Alternative 2 - On-site Containment**

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, involves consolidating, via mechanical excavation, any sediments in site drainage swales and ditches exceeding the 31 mg/kg limit for lead in the containment area, followed by on-site containment of all soils exceeding the 500 mg/kg limit for lead using a cap as a horizontal barrier.

The cap would be placed over the consolidated area barrier. The intent of this alternative is to isolate the waste from receptors and to prevent migration to surface water via soil erosion. The volume or toxicity of waste materials will not reduced as part of this alternative and long term maintenance of the cap will be required.

Capping involves leveling and grading the as required, in order to place a protective soil cap over the area. Included in this alternative would be a provision to monitor the releases from the within the cap. A long term groundwater monitoring plan will be required to ensure that contaminants in the soil remain immobile and do not leach into groundwater.

At SEAD-16, in addition to capping, materials and debris in abandoned Buildings S-311 and 366 will be removed.

On-site hauling is estimated to be done at a rate of 100 cy/hr/dumper truck. Off-site hauling to a Subtitle D landfill is estimated to be done at a rate of 40 cy/day/truck (60 ton/day/truck).

#### 3.3.2.3 **Alternative 3 - In-Situ Treatment**

Solidification/Stabilization is a process in which the waste material is mixed with a variety of solidifying agents including: 1) Portland cement, 2) pozzolanic materials, and 3) proprietary additives. Lime or fly ash are typical stabilization reagents that may also be added. In this case, the

mixing process is performed in-situ. There are several solidification/stabilization mixtures that may be feasible for in-situ remediation, pending treatability testing (refer to Section 4.0). Once treated,

the waste material is allowed to solidify into a monolithic mass having significant unconfined compressive strength, physical stability and rigid, cement-like texture. This process decreases constituent mobility by binding constituents into a leach-resistant, concrete-like matrix while increasing the waste material volume as much as 20 to 50%.

Alternative 3, the in-situ treatment alternative involves in-place solidification of soil and sediments using large hollow stem augers and injecting a grout or cemetous slurry during the mechanical mixing process. Any sediments exceeding the 31 mg/kg limit for lead will be consolidated by excavation in the area that will be solidified. The remaining soils exceeding the 500 mg/kg limit for lead will be solidified and stabilized, in-situ, using a large specialized auger or equivalent mixing equipment. Following the in-place mixing, the soil and solidification mixture would cure to form a solidified mass of sufficient structural integrity to resist weathering. Monitoring would be required to assure that the treatment will continue to be effective.

At SEAD-16, in addition to in-situ treatment, material and debris from Building S-311 and 366 will be removed.

#### 3.3.2.4 **Alternative 4 - Off-Site Disposal**

Alternative 4 is the off-site disposal alternative and involves excavation of soils that exceed the remedial action goals of 500 mg/kg for soil and 31 mg/kg for sediment. The material and debris from Buildings S-311 and 366 at SEAD-16 will also be removed and disposed of with the soil. Excavated soils and sediments that exceed the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) limits must be solidified prior to disposal in a Subtitle D Landfill that meets the NYSDEC and USEPA Subtitle D landfill construction specifications. Solidification involves processing soils through a mechanical mixing operation where a solidifying agent, either pozzolon/portland cement or pozzolon/lime/fly ash, is added in sufficient quantity to completely solidify the soils that exceed the TCLP limits. It should be noted that TCLP is not a clean up level, rather it determines whether the soils are characteristic waste and the type of disposal required. Solidified soils and the remainder of contaminated soils, i.e., those that exceed the remedial action goals for lead, will be disposed of in an off-site Subtitle D solid waste industrial landfill. Both on-site and off-site solidification have been considered. However, because of the small volume of soil to be treated at SEAD-16 and 17, it is expected that off-site treatment will be more cost effective. Therefore, this alternative assumes all excavated soil is transported offsite for both treatment and disposal.

Excavation of soils will be accomplished using a front-end loader or similar equipment. A bulldozer may be used if necessary, to loosen the shale fill prior to loading into dumper trucks for off-site hauling. Loading will use one or two 5 cubic yard (CY) bucket front-end loaders. Monitoring will be required to assure that the remedial action will continue to be effective.

### 3.3.2.5 **Alternative 5 - On-Site Disposal**

Alternative 5 is the On-Site Disposal Alternative, similar to Alternative 4. It involves excavation of soils that exceed the remedial action goals of 500 mg/kg for soil and 31 mg/kg for sediment. As with the other alternatives, the material and debris from Buildings S-311 and 366 at SEAD-16 will also be removed and disposed of with the soil. Soils expected to exceed TCLP limits are solidified as described for Alternative 4. Solidification will be performed on-site, and the solidified soils and remainder of contaminated soils will be disposed of in an on-site landfill, which will be constructed nearby SEAD-16 and 17. The landfill will be constructed to meet the requirements of a Subtitle D landfill for the USEPA and NYSDEC identified in 6 NYCCR Part 360 for landfill construction.

Excavation of soils will be accomplished using a front-end loader or similar equipment. A bulldozer may be used if necessary, to loosen the shale fill prior to loading into dumper trucks for on-site hauling. Loading will use one or two 5 cubic yard (CY) bucket front-end loaders. Monitoring will be required to assure that the remedial action will continue to be effective.

#### 3.3.2.6 **Alternative 6 - Innovative Treatment**

Alternative 6 is the innovative treatment alternative, which involves soil washing. For this alternative, the sediments and soils will be excavated and washed using physical separation techniques to separate the coarse fraction of soil from the fine fraction. The coarse fraction will be backfilled as clean fill, providing this fraction meets RAOs. The fine fraction is expected to contain the majority of the target constituents of concern, e.g., lead, and can either be treated onsite or off-site for disposal in an off-site solid waste landfill. Building debris and material from SEAD-16 will also be removed and disposed of in an off-site landfill.

On-site treatment can include either solidification or acid leaching to remove any characteristic that the washed soil may exhibit for toxicity in order to allow off-site disposal in a solid waste landfill. If the fine fraction is acid extracted and successful at reducing the concentration of lead in soils to below 500 mg/kg, it may be possible to further minimize the volume of soil that will require off-site disposal. Some residuals, however, will required off-site disposal, as well as the material removed from the buildings at SEAD-16. On site treatment, however, is less cost effective for small amounts of soil such as for SEAD-16 and 17. Therefore, this alternative assumes all treatment is performed off-site.

Soil washing has been identified as an effective technology for soil treatment at SEAD-16 and 17 because soils that comprise the site areas are made-up of a large quantity of coarse particles, i.e. crushed shale imported from a SEDA borrow pit, and a small quantity of fine particles, i.e. the portion of the glacial till that is less than the 200 micron particle size for clay. From various particle size distribution curves generated during the RI, it has been determined that the fine fraction in the site soil varies from 24 to 67 percent with median of approximately 36%. The fine fraction in sediment varies from 5 to 95 percent with median of approximately 56%. The inorganic and organic constituents that are of interest for treatment tend to bind chemically or physically to the smaller quantity of fine-grained silt and clay particles. The silt and clay, in turn, are attached to sand and gravel particles by physical processes, primarily compaction and adhesion. Washing processes that separate the smaller fraction of fine clay and silt particles from the larger fraction of coarse sand and gravel soil particles can thus effectively separate and concentrate chemical constituents into a smaller volume of soil that can be further treated or disposed. The clean, larger fraction of coarse material can be returned to the site for continued use. Therefore, by employing a combination of physical separation techniques, the process of soil washing reduces the volume of waste material by causing constituents to be separated from the larger quantity of coarse particles and concentrated into the smaller quantity fine particles. Soil washing is expected to be completed at a rate of 25 tph or about 17 CY/hr.

Once the particles have been separated the fine fraction can either be transported off-site for treatment and disposal or can be treated further to remove the inorganic components using acids. A combination of flurosilcic acid ( $H_2S$ i $F_6$ ), nitric acid ( $H_2NO_3$ ) and hydrochloric acid (HCL) have been utilized as effective agents for solubilizing metal contaminants in various soil washing processes. In general, acid is slowly added to a water and soil slurry to achieve and maintain a pH of 2. Precautions are taken to avoid lowering the pH below 2 and disrupting the soil matrix. When extraction is complete, the soil is rinsed, neutralized, and dewatered. The extraction solution and

rinsewater are regenerated. The regeneration process removes entrained soil, organics, and heavy metals from the extraction fluid. Heavy metals are concentrated in a form potentially suitable for recovery. Recovered acid is recycled to the extraction unit. Other metal chelating agents such as EDTA have been attempted but generally have not produced effective results. Following treatment, soil may be re-used as daily cover in a Subtitle D landfill or backfilled on-site. The U.S. Bureau of Mines has developed an acid leaching process that recovers lead from the acid leaching solution using electrochemical techniques. The outcome is an ingot of lead that can be recycled as scrap lead. This is an option that can be implemented as part of the soil washing option but will require treatability testing to determine the proper acid type and quantities.

The technology of soil washing varies from vendor to vendor but will generally consist of many unit operations including the following:

# **Physical Separation Unit Operations**

- dry screening (grizzly screen)
- dry screening (vibratory screen)
- dry trommel screen
- wet sieves
- attrition scrubber (wet)  $\bullet$
- dense media separator (wet) ۰
- hydrocyclone separators
- flotation separator ۰
- gravity separators
- dewatering equipment  $\bullet$
- clarifiers  $\bullet$
- filter presses

# **Chemical Extraction Unit Operations**

- washwater treatment/recycle
- residual treatment and disposal
- treated water discharge

#### $3.4$ **SCREENING CRITERIA**

#### $3.4.1$ **General**

Alternatives assembled in Section 3.2 and defined in Section 3.3 have been screened in this section. The six alternatives, listed on Table 3-1, have been evaluated against short-term and longterm aspects of three broad criteria: effectiveness, implementability and cost.

# Table 3-1 SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

# ASSEMBLED REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section3\TAB3-1.XLS

The purpose of screening is to reduce the number of alternatives that will undergo detailed analysis. The screening conducted in this section is of a general nature. Although this is necessarily a qualitative screening, care has been taken to ensure that screening criteria are applied consistently to each alternative and that comparisons have been made on an equal basis, at approximately the same level of detail. These criteria consist of several elements shown as follows.

#### $3.4.2$ **Effectiveness**

A key aspect of the screening evaluation is the effectiveness of each alternative in protecting human health and the environment. This screening criterion includes the evaluation of each alternative as to the protectiveness it provides and the reductions in toxicity, mobility, or volume it achieves.

- Short-term protectiveness of human health Rating the potential for the remedial action to affect human health during remedial action. Both on- and off-site exposures are considered under this criterion. Exposure routes include inhalation, ingestion, and dermal absorption.
- Long-term protectiveness of human health Rating the effectiveness of the remedial action to alleviate adverse human health effects after the remedial action is complete. The ability of an alternative to minimize future exposures is considered under this criterion. Exposure routes include inhalation, ingestion, and dermal absorption.
- Short-term protectiveness of the environment Rating the effectiveness of the remedial action to prevent environmental receptors from being affected by constituents during remedial action.
- Long-term protectiveness of the environment Rating the effectiveness of the remedial action to prevent environmental receptors from being affected by constituents after remedial action is completed.
- Reduction of mobility, toxicity, or volume of waste Rating of effectiveness in changing one or more characteristics of the medium by treatment to decrease risks associated with chemical constituents present.

### 3.4.3 Implementability

Implementability is a measure of both the technical and administrative feasibility of constructing and operating a remedial action alternative.

- Technical feasibility Rating of the ability to construct, reliably operate, and meet technology-specific regulations for process options until a remedial action is complete. That also includes monitoring of the alternative, if required, after the remedial action is complete.
- Administrative feasibility Rating of the ability to obtain approvals from regulatory agencies and the Army; the availability of treatment, storage, and disposal services; and the requirements for, and availability of, specific equipment and technical specialists.

### 3.4.4 **Costs**

Both capital and operation and maintenance have been considered during the screening of alternatives.

Capital costs - these were estimated based on order-of-magnitude vendor unit costs.

Operating and maintenance (O&M) costs  $-$  O&M costs were estimated based on the long term monitoring and maintenance requirements.

#### 3.4.5 **Numeric Rating System**

The alternatives were evaluated by applying a simple numeric rating system. Each alternative was assigned a value ranging between 1 and 6 for a particular criteria. The value assignments were based on both experience and the overall characteristics of the alternatives. If a specific alternative was considered very unfavorable for a given criteria a value of 1 was assigned relative to the other alternatives within the criteria. Likewise, if a particular alternative was considered very favorable, a rating value of 6 was assigned to it relative to the other alternatives within that criteria. Rating scores of 2 through 4 were given to distinguish varying degrees of unfavorable and favorable alternatives. The individual criteria values were summed for each alternative and the totals used to screen alternatives.

### **ALTERNATIVES SCREENING**  $3.5$

#### $3.5.1$ **Method of Scoring**

The screening results are presented in Table 3-2 for the six alternatives listed in rows and screening criteria listed in columns. Screening was conducted by considering one column (one criteria) at a time, independent of the other columns and relative to the other alternatives, particularly the no action alternative. The first step was to review each alternative and identify the alternatives that represent the two extreme values (1 and 6), with 6 representing the most favorable score and 1 representing the worst score, for a particular evaluation factor. The values were applied consistently and unbiasedly to each alternative on this column-by-column basis. The total score for each alternative was then summed and used as the basis for proceeding to the detailed evaluation. The following sections present the qualitative rationale for each factor that were utilized to assign values to each alternative.

### $3.5.2$ **Effectiveness**

#### **Short-Term Human Health Protectiveness**  $3.5.2.1$

All alternatives provide short term human health protectiveness. This assessment ranks the relative merits that each may provide over another one. The assessment of short-term human health protectiveness was based upon any factor that would increase exposure or increase physical hazards and the quickness and completeness that an alternative could be implemented to protect human health.

Activities that contribute to increased exposure are excavation, which is the first step in many alternatives. Excavation is considered to lower short-term worker protectiveness relative to no action, even with dust controls applied and personal protection equipment used by remediation workers. Other factors that increase short term risks are activities that increase off-site exposure such as: fugitive dust emissions due to on-site movement of construction vehicles, runoff during excavation and physical and/or noise hazards such as increased truck traffic through local streets. Alternatives identified as limiting these exposure scenarios were ranked higher than those that did not. Alternatives that involved excavation followed by off-site transportation were perceived as increasing the risk the most and was consequently ranked the lowest.

TABLE 3-2<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY<br>SCREENING OF SOIL REMEDIATION ALTERNATIVES



Alternative 1, the no-action alternative, was ranked the highest for this screening criterion with a 6 since no excavation is conducted. Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since this alternative does not involve a large amount of excavation, has limited off-site traffic and can be implemented quickly as it does not require specialized equipment or vendors. The only excavation of contaminated materials is from the drainage ditches, except at SEAD-16 when removal of debris and materials form the buildings will be conducted. However, there is a risk for fugitive dust emissions during compaction. The construction of the impermeable cap can involve off-site hauling of clay and possibly clean fill for the protective cover, thereby increasing truck traffic in the area, which was identified as a negative factor. However, this factor can be limited through the use of a geosynthetic membrane in place of clay and obtaining clean fill from other areas of the depot, instead of off-depot, thereby limiting off-depot traffic.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 4. It involves the same amount of excavation as Alternative 2, since for both alternatives only sediment in the drainage ditches will require excavation to an area where in-situ mixing will be performed, and building materials and debris at SEAD-16 will be removed. Alternative 3 was ranked lower than Alternative 2, even though both are low excavation alternatives, because this alternative will involve hauling a large amount of solidification materials, which will thereby increase off-depot traffic. Further, due to the specialized nature of the solidification process, the time to implement this alternative is greater than for Alternative 2.

Alternative 5, the on-site disposal alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 3 since, in addition to the excavation of sediment in the drainage ditches and removal of building materials and debris at SEAD-16, the remaining soil will be excavated. However, this material will not be transported off-site, therefore this alternative was ranked moderately.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked lower than Alternative 5 even though both alternatives involve a similar amount of excavation. This alternative will require a specialized vendor which will increase the time to implement. This alternative may involve storage of acids or other materials that can cause spills, thereby increasing exposure. Further, off-site disposal of any residuals, and materials from the building at SEAD-16 will be required therefore this alternative was considered only moderately protective.

Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, was ranked with a 1 since this alternative involves the off-site transport of contaminated soil in addition to excavation.

#### 3.5.2.2 **Long-Term Human Health Protectiveness**

All alternatives, other than the no action alternative, protect human health in the long term. This assessment ranks the relative merits that each may provide over another one. The assessment of long-term human health protectiveness is based upon factors that could cause risk due to a increase in exposure from releases of treated materials. Alternatives identified as having the least potential for causing releases over the life of an alternative were ranked higher than those that did not. Alternatives that involve treatment, either from entrainment or metals removal and recovery, were considered more favorable than alternatives that did not involve a treatment process, since treatment will be one additional step to assure reduced potential for long term releases.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the highest for this screening criterion with a 6, since this alternative will provide the highest amount of treatment. This alternative accomplishes both volume reduction, and may also accomplish treatment from acid estraction or solidification of the washed soil, if these activities are performed on-site. Even though a portion of residuals and material from the building at SEAD-16 will be disposed of off-site in a landfill, this alternative was considered the most protective as it provides the most treatment.

Alternative 5, the on-site disposal alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since this alternative also involves treatment, though not as much as for alternative 6. This alternative includes on-site stabilization/solidification and construction of a new on-site landfill which is designed and constructed to hold soil contaminated with heavy metals and material and debris removed from the buildings at SEAD-16. Since this landfill will be on-site, it will be easy to monitor and maintain to assure long term effectiveness. In addition, the landfill will not be subjected to other chemical wastes or be subjected to physical hazards such as increased vehicle traffic that may adversely affect the physical integrity of the liner or cap. The long term liabilities associated with off-site disposal, both financial and legal, due to releases at an off-site landfill would be eliminated.

Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, was ranked moderately with a 4 since this alternative involves some treatment and no contaminated soil or materials will remain on-site. However, due to the uncertainties associated with off-site disposal and long term liabilities at an off-site facility, it was not ranked as high as the on-site alternative.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 3 since it involves treatment, albeit in-situ. This alternative was only ranked moderately since all treatment would be performed in-situ, which can lead to uncertainties due to the variable effectiveness and completeness of a mixing process that cannot be fully observed.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the next to lowest with a 2 since this alternative does not involve any treatment and includes some uncertainty associated with the long term effectiveness of the protective cover/cap.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked with a 1 since lead in soil and sediment and, materials and debris in the buildings at SEAD-16 will continue to contribute to the potential long term human health impacts.

#### 3.5.2.3 **Short-Term Environmental Protectiveness**

All alternatives other than the no action alternative provide short term environmental protectiveness. This assessment ranks the merits that one alternative may provide over another. The evaluation of short-term environmental protectiveness has been based upon factors that could cause exposure to environmental receptors. As with short term human health protectiveness, excavation is considered to lower short-term protectiveness as this process would increase the potential to expose contaminants to the environment and environmental receptors. Other activities that disturb the natural conditions are perceived as factors that would contribute to increased environmental risk. These activities include any other construction process such as: setup of field offices, staging areas or other support facilities, movement of heavy equipment, sediment removal in the drainage ditches and noise hazards. These activities contribute to increase short term environmental risk by either increasing fugitive dust emissions, decreasing available wildlife habitat or causing noise that will disturb environmental receptors. Alternatives that involve constructing landfills were considered as contributing to environmental risk by decreasing habitat for wildlife.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative involved only a small amount of excavation in the drainage ditches removal of material and debris from the buildings at SEAD-16 and no permanent elimination of wildlife habitat. This alternative can be implemented in a short period of time thereby limiting the time that environmental receptors will be impacted.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5. Since although it involved the same, limited, amount of excavation and removal as Alternative 2, it was ranked higher due to the large soil mixing equipment that would be on-site for longer than that required for Alternative 2, thereby causing greater disturbance to wildlife.

Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, was ranked with a 4 since, even though this alternative involves a large amount of excavation and removal, off-site hauling is not perceived as having a significant effect on environmental receptors as truck traffic would be limited to existing roadways. The effect time to implement this alternative and the ability of this alternative to eliminate continued environmental exposure to pollutants was considered a positive factor. These factors, in addition to the fact that no wildlife habitat or resources would be lost, were grounds for rating this alternative moderately high.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked with a 3 since it will involve a large amount of excavation and removal.

Alternative 5, the on-site disposal alternative, was ranked slightly lower than Alternative 6 with a 2, since this alternative will also involve a large amount excavation, thereby causing disturbance to environmental receptors and eliminating a large amount of habitat by construction of an on-site landfill.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the lowest with a 1. Although no excavation would be performed, the existing conditions have been identified as currently adversely impacting human and environmental receptors, and there are no provisions to restrict exposure.

### 3.5.2.4 **Long-Term Environmental Protectiveness**

All alternatives, other than the no action alternative, provide long term protection of the environment. This assessment ranks the relative merits that each may provide over another. The assessment of long-term environmental protectiveness is based upon factors that could cause risks due to a increase in exposure for environmental receptors from releases of treated materials. Alternatives identified as having the least potential for causing releases over the life of an alternative were ranked higher over those that did not. Alternatives that involved treatment, either from entrainment or metals removal and recovery, were considered more favorable than alternatives that did not involve a treatment process, since treatment would be an additional step to assure reduced potential for long term releases.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative would provide the highest amount of treatment, from both volume reduction and treatment by either acid extraction or by solidification of the remaining soil volumes.

Alternative 5, the on-site disposal alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since this alternative involves treatment using stabilization/solidification in addition to the construction of an on-site landfill, which will be designed and constructed to hold the contaminated materials long term. This alternative was deemed superior to an in-situ treatment or containment alternative because it will provide a greater degree of assurance that materials will remain contained, since the landfill will be aboveground, newly designed, and monitored and maintained by the federal government. Further, because the landfill will be designed and operated for remediation of these sites which are within SEDA, other chemical wastes or physical hazards such as daily vehicle traffic associated with a commercial off-site landfill will be controlled and restricted. A higher ranking is thus merited due to the decrease in potential adverse effects of these factors on long term integrity of the landfill.

Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, was ranked with a 4 since this alternative involves some treatment and eliminates the long term impacts to the environment by physically removing the risk producing constituents from the site. Although the risks are removed and will not affect the environment at SEAD-16 or 17, the pollutants could affect the environment if released daily transport or at another landfill. Due to the long term liabilities and uncertainties associated with off-site disposal, this alternative was ranked lower than the on-site alternative.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 3 since it involves treatment, albeit in-situ. This alternative was only ranked moderately since there are uncertainties in the effectiveness of the mixing process that cannot be fully evaluated. These uncertainties arise as a result of the variability of the layers of till at the site. The non-uniform nature of the matrix that will require solidification will contribute to mixing difficulties and decrease effectiveness of treatment.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the next to lowest with a 2 since this alternative does not involve any treatment of soils and includes some uncertainty associated with the long term effectiveness of the protective cover/cap.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked with a 1 since lead in soil and sediment and constituents in the building at SEAD-16 will continue to contribute to long term human and environmental impacts.

#### 3.5.2.5 **Reductions In Toxicity**

The assessment of toxicity reduction is based upon factors that would decrease the toxicity of the constituents of concern. Alternatives or processes that chemically or physically bind with the inorganics constituents provide the greatest reduction of toxicity as these constituents are no longer in a form that would be biologically available for uptake. The alternatives that provided the greatest reduction in toxicity through solidification or treatment were subsequently ranked higher than those that did not. Entrainment within a solidified matrix of cement or metals removal and recovery are examples of treatment alternatives that were considered more favorable than alternatives that did not involve treatment.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative will provide the highest amount of treatment, from both volume reduction and treatment by either acid extraction or by solidification of the remaining soil volumes. Since all alternatives except Alternative 1, remove materials from the buildings at SEAD-16, reductions in toxicity of building materials is equal for all and does not affect ranking for this criteria.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since it involves treatment that would reduce the toxicity by binding metals in a cementous matrix. Alternative 6 was ranked higher than Alternative 3, even though both involve a large amount of treatment, because Alternative 3 has more potential for incomplete mixing since it will be performed in-situ. Therefore Alternative 3 has more uncertainty for reducing toxicity than Alternative 6.

Alternatives 5 and 4, the on-site and off-site disposal alternatives, are similar in nature and were ranked the next highest with a 4 and a 3, respectively. These alternatives are very similar and involve some treatment using stabilization/solidification, but only for the soils that exceed the toxicity characteristic. Although only a portion of the soils will be treated to reduce the toxicity of the soils, some toxicity reduction will be achieved. The only difference between these two alternatives is the location of the treatment facility and the landfill. Landfilling, by itself, will not reduce toxicity since there is no treatment associated with the landfilling process other than what would be expected in isolating the waste in a landfill. Alternative 5, the on-site landfill alternative, was ranked slightly higher than Alternative 4 because the types of other wastes that would be placed in an on-site landfill and mixed with the soils from SEAD-16 and 17 would be limited and controlled. An off-site landfill would potentially accept other wastes that, when mixed with the soils from SEAD-16 and 17, could adversely affect the treated waste and possibly increase toxicity.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the next to lowest with a 2 since this alternative does not involve any treatment of soils or reduction in toxicity.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked with a 1 since there is no reduction in the toxicity of lead in soil and sediment or in constituents in the buildings at SEAD-16.

#### 3.5.2.6 **Reduction In Mobility**

Mobility reduction factors are closely related to those that involve reductions in toxicity and the rankings were identical to that determined previously for toxicity. As the focus of this effort is to reduce the concentration of inorganic compounds, specifically lead, this assessment ranked alternatives that involved a chemical or physical reaction resulting in the formation of a less mobile state of the metals, as preferable over alternatives that did not involve a beneficial reaction. A beneficial reaction is a reaction that results in the formation of insoluble compounds like hydroxides. Such compounds will be produced during the stabilization/solidification process. Other beneficial reactions include the formation of the base metal that would be produced during the electrochemical process of reducing and recovering metallic ions following soil washing and acid extraction. In general, alternatives that involve treatment, either from entrainment or metals removal, reduction and/or recovery, were considered favorable in reducing mobility. Alternatives that involve containment also provide mobility reduction, but these alternatives were viewed as less desirable since the mobility reduction is dependent on maintaining the integrity of the containment Uncertainties associated with containment systems, i.e. formation of leaks, were system. considered as factors that would decrease the ability of an alternative to reduce mobility and were ranked slightly below treatment alternatives.
Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative will provide the highest amount of treatment.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since it involves a large amount of treatment that will reduce the mobility by binding metals in a cementous matrix. Alternative 6 was ranked higher than Alternative 3 because of the uncertainties associated with achieving a completely mixed system in-situ.

Alternatives 5 and 4, the on-site and off-site disposal alternatives, are similar in nature and were ranked the next highest with a 4 and a 3, respectively. These alternatives involve a limited amount of treatment by stabilization/solidification for soils that exceed the toxicity characteristic. This process will achieve mobility reduction as a result. However, landfilling the remaining soils will not reduce mobility other than what would be expected by physically isolating the waste in a landfill. These alternatives were ranked moderately due to the uncertainties associated with potential leaks that occasionally occur in landfills. Alternative 5 was ranked slightly higher than Alternative 4 since the uncertainties associated with mixing other types of wastes with the soils from the SEAD-16 and 17 would be more restricted, limited and controlled in an on-site landfill than an off-site landfill. An off-site landfill could potentially accept other wastes that may mix with the soils from SEAD-16 and 17 and increase mobility through processes such as chelation with organic acids produced during decomposition of organic materials.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the next to lowest with a 2 since this alternative does not involve any treatment of soils or reduction in mobility other than the physical restrictions of migration resulting from the cap.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the lowest with a 1 since there is no reduction in the mobility of lead.

### **Reduction in Volume** 3.5.2.7

The rankings for volume reduction are different than for other reduction factors. Any alternative that will cause an increase in volume was ranked lower than those alternatives that will not cause an increase. Although some volume increase is expected during excavation, Alternative 6, the soil washing alternative is a volume reduction alternative and is intended to reduce the volume of soil the most (by up to approximately 50%), using wet separation techniques. Once the volume has been reduced, the remaining fraction can be reduced further if physical separation is followed by acid extraction. The metallic ions can also be reduced electrochemically and recovered as the base metal. If solidification is chosen, it will cause an increase in the volume due to the addition of cement or another material that is used to incorporate the soil material. This volume increase varies depending upon the mixture used and the ratio of soil to admixture, but can be as much as 50%. However, this volume increase is often approximately 20% and a net volume reduction is expected for this alternative.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked next to highest with a 5 because this alternative will involve only a minimal amount of volume increase due to excavation of the sediments. It was not ranked higher than Alternative 6 because there is no volume reduction associated with this alternative.

Alternatives 5 and 4, the on-site and off-site disposal alternatives, are similar in nature and were ranked with a 4 and a 3, respectively. Both alternatives involve an identical, yet limited, amount volume increase due to the treatment by stabilization/solidification and excavation. However, Alternative 5 was ranked slightly higher than Alternative 4 because the uncertainties associated with the compaction process (which is considered a volume reduction process), that is used prior to placing the soils in a landfill are more controlled in an on-site landfill than an off-site landfill.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked with a 2 since it involves a large volume increase as a result of solidification.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the lowest with a 1 since there is no reduction in the volume of lead.

### 3.5.2.8 Permanence

All alternatives, with the exception of the no action alternative, will achieve a permanent solution. Alternatives that have the longest lifespan, preferably permanent, with the least amount of continued attention would be considered attractive and were ranked high. Factors that were deemed favorable in evaluating the permanence of an alternative included those that would permanently remove lead from soil. Those alternatives that involved containment were not ranked as high as those alternatives that completely removed metals from soil. This is because containment alternatives require long term care and maintenance to assure that the constructed

containment structure will remain intact and permanent, whereas alternatives that involve a treatment process that will remove metals from the soil do not require continued attention because the constituents of concern are eliminated. These alternatives are therefore more permanent and preferred.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative involves removing lead from soil.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since it involves treatment that would permanently bind the metals into a cementous matrix.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked with a 4 since this alternative involves construction of a permanent aboveground cap. However, the cap will require some attention to assure permanence of this alternative. This alternative was ranked higher than the landfill alternatives because the cap will require less maintenance.

Alternatives 5 and 4, the on-site and off-site disposal alternatives, are similar in nature and were ranked the next highest with a 3 and a 2, respectively. These alternatives involve a limited amount of treatment by stabilization/solidification for soils that exceed the toxicity characteristic. Since landfills are not considered permanent, these alternatives were ranked low.

Alternative 5 was ranked slightly higher than Alternative 4 since maintaining a landfill on-site will be more controlled and certain than an off-site landfill.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the lowest with a 1 since site conditions are subject to climatic change and is considered to be the least permanent alternative.

### 3.5.2.9 **ARAR Compliance**

There are currently no chemical specific ARARs for lead in soil. Any off-site disposal will fall under RCRA requirements, which must be complied with in the final remedial action plan. Other federal ARARs include but are not limited to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), CERCLA, the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the Emergency Planning and Right to Know Act (EPCRA). Promulgated state regulations must also be complied with. After an alternative is chosen, the final design must incorporate compliance with ARARs, however, the concepts of each alternative consider ARARs and do not preclude compliance. Each alternative has an equal potential to fully comply with ARARs, with the exception of the No-Action alternative. Therefore, all alternatives were ranked with a 6, except the No-Action alternative, which was ranked with a 1.

### 3.5.3 Implementability

Implementability is a measure of both the technical and administrative ease and likelihood that an alternative could be implemented. Site factors, such as the need to construct a long road around a wetland in order to protect it, restrictions on the time of year that construction activities could be performed due to flooding or wildlife nesting activities, are examples of construction difficulties that reduce the implementability of an alternative. Long term monitoring requirements and continued attention are also considered as negative factors in implementing an alternative. The ability of an alternative to obtain any necessary regulatory permits and the availability of vendors to implement an alternative are additional factors that could affect the ease of an alternative to be implemented.

### Constructability 3.5.3.1

There are no current restrictions at either SEAD-16 or 17 that would prevent construction for an alternative. The site is located in a remote section of the depot and has easy access from several directions. Since the facility is a military reservation there are security restrictions that will need to be adhered, including restrictions on the use of open flames and spark producing devices, but these restrictions are not considered significant to affect the ability of an alternative to be constructed. The drainage ditches are adjacent to the site but are not considered to be large enough to cause difficulties in implementing an alternative. Winter conditions can occasionally be severe at times but are temporary and should not cause prolonged delays. In general, all the alternatives are constructible and therefore the rankings will focus on rating those alternatives from the easiest to construct to most difficult.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative would be the easiest to implement.

Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5. This alternative is considered the easiest, other than doing nothing, to implement since it involves simple excavation

November 1997

and hauling operations. In addition, solidification of soils that exceed the TCLP limit will be performed off-site at the off-site disposal facility.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 4 since this alternative involves leaving soils in place and constructing a cap. The construction of the cap would involve some specialized equipment but is considered to be relatively standard and will not require very deep excavating equipment.

Alternative 5, on-site disposal alternative, was ranked with a 3 because of the need to construct an on-site landfill. Although technically feasible to construct, the presence of shallow bedrock would limit the depth and lateral extent of the landfill. This, along with the presence of wetlands within a 1 mile radius of the site, would provide some construction complications that cause this alternative to be ranked lower.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next to lowest with a 2 since it involves specialized in-situ mixing equipment and is more complicated than simple excavating.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the lowest with a 1 since this alternative would involve construction of the most sophisticated and complicated unit operations, which are associated with soil washing and treatment.

### 3.5.3.2 **Long-Term Monitoring**

It is technically feasible to implement a long term monitoring program for each of the alternatives. Such a plan would be most appropriate and required for alternatives that involved containment or landfilling. For these alternatives, monitoring would be used to assure that the waste isolation system has remained secure. Typically, monitoring involves a network of monitoring wells that are strategically placed to intercept any release. A statistical procedure is used to compare data sets from downgradient and upgradient wells in order to determine changes that would suggest a release has occurred. If a release has been detected then an assessment and a remediation plan can be implemented to control the release. Long term monitoring would also include monitoring the condition of the cap to assure that the integrity of the cap has been maintained. If the cap monitoring detects a breach then reconstruction of the cap can be implemented to minimize the effects of the breach. For this evaluation, alternatives that involve containment or landfilling would require a similar monitoring plan for groundwater and other media and were considered to be equivalent. In this instance the ranking based upon the degree of necessity of a monitoring plan in order to detect a release. The alternatives that require the most monitoring were ranked less favorably than those that require little or no monitoring.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative will not involve any monitoring.

Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since this alternative will not involve monitoring because all soils will be removed and placed in an off-site landfill. The off-site landfill will be monitored by the landfill operator, but not by the federal government.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 4 since this alternative will involve only monitoring of the treated soils to assure compliance with the RAOS, but will not require any long term monitoring because no contaminated materials will remain onsite.

Alternative 5, the on-site disposal alternative, was ranked with a 3 because of the need for long term monitoring of the on-site landfill. Although there is the potential for this landfill to leak, it was ranked higher than Alternative 2 because it included removal of all soils, followed by the construction of a new engineered landfill that would have less likelihood to leak than soils left in place.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked with a 2 since it will involve a monitoring network to monitor groundwater. Although there is little evidence to suggest significant leaching of metals to groundwater, and heavy metals are relatively immobile, a long term monitoring plan to ensure continued immobility of the site contaminants is merited. A portion of the soils would remain in contact with the groundwater, therefore there is a possibility that leakage could occur.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked the lowest with a 1 since this alternative involves leaving soils in place and in contact with groundwater and would require long term monitoring for both the groundwater and the cap. It was ranked the lowest since it was perceived as the most likely alternative for a monitoring program to detect a release as the in place soils were not treated.

November 1997

### 3.5.3.3 **Agency Approval**

In general, when a remedial action is required, alternatives that meet remedial objectives, comply with ARARs, minimize off-site disposal, are permanent and reduce the toxicity, mobility and volume of pollutants will meet the goals of the NCP and are considered to be the agency preferred alternatives.

All alternatives will meet the remedial action objectives for the site with the exception of the no action alternative. Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since this alternative will minimize off-site disposal, is permanent, and reduces the toxicity of the pollutants.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next highest with a 5 since it involves treatment that will permanently bind the metals in an on-site cementous matrix.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked with a 4 since this alternative involves construction of a permanent cap that will require some maintenance but will not reduce the toxicity, mobility or volume of the metals.

Alternatives 5 and 4, the on-site and off-site disposal alternatives, are similar in nature and were ranked with a 3 and a 2, respectively. These alternatives involve a limited amount of treatment by stabilization/solidification followed by landfilling the remaining soils. Since landfills are not considered permanent, these alternatives were ranked low. Alternative 5 was ranked slightly higher than Alternative 4 since an on-site landfill will minimize off-site disposal and does not involve transportation of un-solidified soils.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the lowest with a 1 since it does not meet the remedial action objectives for the site and is considered to be the least permanent alternative.

### 3.5.3.4 **Availability**

The evaluation of availability involves consideration of the availability of vendors, equipment and space for implementing an alternative. Alternatives that involve highly specialized equipment or vendors that are limited are factors that contribute to long term delays associated with implementing an alternative and are negative factors.

November 1997

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the highest with a 6 since it readily available.

Alternatives 5 and 4, the on-site and off-site disposal alternatives, are similar in nature and were ranked with a 4 and a 5, respectively. These alternatives are easily implemented and readily available since they involve excavation using standard earth moving equipment. Alternative 4 was ranked slightly higher than Alternative 5 since off-site landfills are readily available in the area to dispose of the soil. In addition, Alternative 5 was ranked lower because the installation of an impermeable cap was considered somewhat specialized and limited to a few vendors or suppliers of clay. There is sufficient land available on-site to construct an on-site landfill which, other than the construction of the cap, will not require specialized equipment.

Alternative 2, the containment alternative, was ranked with a 3 since this alternative involves construction of a permanent cap that will require specialized material that is less available and limited to a few vendors.

Alternative 3, the in-situ alternative, was ranked the next to lowest with a 2 since it requires specialized in-situ mixing equipment, which is less available than standard equipment used for previous alternatives.

Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, was ranked the next to lowest with a 1 since this alternative would require specialized equipment and vendors. The equipment for this alternative is more specialized than that required for Alternative 3, therefore it merits a lower ranking. Although this alternative is specialized and limited to a few vendors, there is an adequate soil washing capacity provided by several US vendors who have licensed European technologies.

### 3.5.4 **Costs**

The costs are evaluated for both capital and operation and maintenance  $(O\&M)$  costs and are based upon vendor quotes, quantity estimates, experience at other remedial action sites and engineering judgement. The costs are provided for feasibility analyses and are considered to be order of magnitude estimates for screening purposes only, and accurate to within +50% and -30%. Capital costs are costs for materials, labor and other direct costs, such as equipment and facilities rentals, that are required to implement an alternative. Operation and maintenance costs are those required to maintain an alternative, and include labor and analytical costs associated with groundwater

monitoring or costs required to maintain and repair a cap. The total cost for each alternative is the sum of the capital cost and the O&M cost.

### 3.5.4.1 **Capital Cost**

Capital costs for remedial alternatives have been estimated, whenever possible, using vendor supplied information for the unit operations associated with each of the six alternatives. These unit costs are as follows:

- Off-site transport, treatment and disposal in a Subtitle D landfill \$68/CY (based on a per cubic yard (CY) unit disposal cost from Earthwatch Landfill)
- On-site In-situ solidification \$400/CY (based on costs provided in SITE report for in-situ stabilization performed by Silicate Technologies)
- On-site Subtitle D landfill (Parsons ES project files) \$180/cy Soil Washing, wet separation (Parsons ES project files) \$300/cy Containment (Parsons ES project files) \$66/cy

These are the most significant unit costs. Other costs such as excavation, material handling, on-site hauling and backfilling are not significant and are within the rounding error of the listed unit costs.

Capital costs for each alternative have been estimated based on 2700 c.y. of material and these unit costs and are presented as follows (refer to Appendix D for cost estimate details):



November 1997



### Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Cost 3.5.4.2

Long-term operation and maintenance (O&M) costs are costs that are incurred after remedial action is completed. The estimated O&M costs estimated from previous experience and cost estimates I Appendix C are provided below:



Alternative 1, the no action alternative, was ranked the highest because there would be no O&M costs.

Alternatives 3, the in-situ alternative, Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative and Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative all have identical O&M costs as the costs assume an identical groundwater monitoring system. Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, was ranked the highest of these three because all the contaminated soils would be removed from the site and the likelihood of future activities associated with a release will be the least. Therefore, this alternative was ranked with a 5. Alternative 6 was ranked the next highest with a 4 since only treated soil will remain on-site, which will have a low possibility for a release and a minimum maintenance of the site will be required. Alternative 3 was ranked the lowest of the three since it will involve monitoring and maintaining a landfill that contained contaminated materials and has the most requirements for a future maintenance activities of these three alternatives.

November 1997

Alternatives 2 and 5, the containment alternative and the on-site disposal alternative, have the most long-term O&M costs because they include both groundwater sampling and cap maintenance. They ranked the lowest with a 1 and a 2, respectively. Alternative 5 was ranked above Alternative 2, the containment alternative, because the O&M cost for an on-site landfill for alternative 5 could be spread out amount sites that contribute waste.

### 3.5.6 **Screening**

The results of the screening of soil remediation alternatives are provided on Table 3-2. The no action alternative scored the lowest with a total score of 45 The containment alternative, Alternative 2, and the in-situ alternative, Alternative 3 also scored low with a score of 52 and 53, respectively. The on-site disposal alternative, Alternative 5, scored the next highest with a score of 54. Alternative 4, the off-site disposal alternative, scored the next to highest with a total score of 56 and Alternative 6, the innovative treatment alternative, scored the highest with a total score of 65. Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 were retained for detailed evaluation. Alternative 1 was also retained for comparitory purposes. Alternatives 2 and 3 were screened out from further consideration because they scored low. In addition, Alternative 3 is the costliest alternative.

### 4.0 **TREATABILITY INVESTIGATIONS**

### $4.1$ **INTRODUCTION**

One of the important parts of most remedial actions is the treatability investigation. In general, there are two primary objectives for treatability studies:

- Provide sufficient data to allow treatment alternatives to be fully developed and evaluated and to support the remedial design of a selected alternative
- Reduce cost and performance uncertainties for treatment alternatives so that a remedy can be selected.

There are three stages in the CERCLA process in which treatability studies may be used, remedy screening, remedy selection, and remedy design. In the remedy screening phase treatability studies are designed to establish whether or not a technology can effectively treat a given waste. These studies generally provide little cost or design data. In the next stage, remedy selection, treatability studies are used to evaluate the site-specific performance of each technology in order to support selection of an alternative. Treatability studies in the remedy selection stage may yield information on 7 of the 9 technology evaluation criteria, including: (EPA, 1991b)

- Overall protection of human health and the environment
- **Compliance with ARARs**
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume
- Short-term effectiveness
- Implementability
- Long-term effectiveness and permanence
- Cost.

This mid-stage of the CERCLA process is implemented prior to the Record of Decision (ROD) and would be referred to as a pre-ROD treatability study.

The last stage of the CERCLA process is the remedy design stage. This stage is implemented after

November 1997

Page 4-1 k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc the ROD has been signed, and these treatability studies are often referred to as post-ROD treatability studies. Post-ROD treatability studies provide quantitative performance, cost, and design information (EPA, 1991b). This information is then used to design the remedial treatment process, refine the remedial action cost estimate, and make accurate predictions of the time required for remediation.

At either SEAD-16 or SEAD-17 there is no need for remedy screening treatability studies. Both technologies being considered for treatment, solidification/stabilization and soil washing are demonstrated. This means that substantial treatability and remedial work has been done with these technologies on sites with similar wastes. Therefore, the only treatability work proposed for this remedial action is pre-ROD testing, since the treatability results can then be used to finalize the remedial selection, design and to develop a detailed cost estimate. Section 4.2 provides a brief overview of the pre-ROD treatability study process. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 describe the detailed treatability procedures for solidification/stabilization and soil washing, respectively.

### **GENERAL TREATABILITY STUDIES**  $4.2$

As described above, this discussion will focus on those treatability studies conducted prior to the ROD. The primary goals of a pre-ROD treatability study are:

- Facilitate the alternative selection process
- To select among multiple vendors and/or processes within a given technology
- To support the detailed design and the development of specifications
- To provide information supporting a detailed cost estimate.

These studies can be conducted either in the laboratory or the field, at bench or pilot scale. For these remedial actions, the treatability studies will likely be conducted in the laboratory, by either the Army, or the various vendors interested in performing the remedial activities.

Bench-scale testing is usually conducted in the laboratory, and is best used to establish treatment parameters. Bench-scale testing is useful for established technologies, such as solidification and soil washing, since it can be used to pinpoint site-specific operating parameters. Pilot-scale testing can be done either at the site or in the laboratory. In pilot-scale testing, smaller versions of the

November 1997

Page 4-2 k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc actual treatment equipment, or the actual treatment equipment may be used. Since solidification/stabilization and soil washing are demonstrated technologies, bench-scale treatability work will be appropriate.

The first step in any treatability study is establishing the treatment goals. These goals include, but are not limited to the attainment of ARARs. For example, an ARAR for the solidification/stabilization of the soils is that the treated soils are not Toxicity Characteristic (TC) hazardous waste. An additional treatment criteria which is not an ARAR, but would be important if an on-site landfill is used, will likely be that the solidified waste have sufficient structural strength to support the cap placed over the landfill. The treatability study workplan will clearly delineate all treatment criteria for this remedial action.

The next step is identifying the Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) and preparing the study workplans. DQOs are qualitative and quantitative statements that specify the requirements for the data collected during the study. The final DQOs will be incorporated into the treatability study design, workplan, sampling and analysis plan, and chemical data acquisition plan will ensure that the data collected are of sufficient quality to support the objectives of the treatability study. For pre-ROD treatability studies, fairly rigorous Quality Assurance/Quality Control (OA/OC) will be required. Since the QA/QC required will be similar to that required for the remedial investigation. the chemical data acquisition plan developed in support of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) (MAIN, 1991) will be modified for use in the treatability testing.

The subsections generally included in a treatability study workplan are:

- Project description
- Remedial technology description
- **Test objectives**
- Experimental design and procedures
- **Equipment and materials**
- Sampling and analysis
- Data management
- Data analysis and interpretation
- Health and safety

November 1997

Page 4-3 k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc

- Residuals management
- Community relations
- Reports
- Schedule
- Management and staffing
	- Budget

Not every one of these items will be described in detail in each workplan, but it is important to at least consider each item. Most of the section titles are self-explanatory, and will not be described in detail, but there are several points which should be highlighted. First, health and safety merits its own section in the workplan. Health and safety is very important because the soil to be treated is likely a hazardous waste prior to treatment. The party implementing the work plan will not only be required to follow the health and safety plan, they must also be in full compliance with all Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and EPA regulations that pertain to working with hazardous wastes.

Residuals management is another important issue. Any soil or sediment which is not successfully treated is still a hazardous waste. In addition, any residuals generated during the testing may be hazardous wastes, and must be handled and disposed of accordingly.

Once the workplan has been completed, the next step in the process is to identify the party that will perform the study. For both solidification/stabilization and soil washing the technologies used by the various vendors are similar. The only major differences between vendors are related to proprietary materials. Therefore, it is likely that the treatability studies will be carried out by vendors so that the appropriate proprietary materials can be used. It will be important to clearly specify the goals of the study so that results from different vendors can be accurately compared and evaluated.

Once the work plans have been finalized and the vendors have been selected, the next step will be to collect a representative sample. In order to better compare the results of each vendor's testing, it best to collect sufficient volume of sample for all the studies to be conducted. A set volume of soil could be collected from each area designated for remediation at SEAD-16 and SEAD-17 in

November 1997

Page 4-4 k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc proportion to the volume of soil to be remediated. All the soil collected would be composited and apportioned to each vendor. This assures that each vendor will be testing similar material.

Once the vendors have completed their studies, the data must be reviewed and assessed prior to contractor selection and completion of detailed designs and specifications. The study results will be reviewed to ensure that each technology meets the specified treatment criteria. All technologies that meet the treatment criteria will then be reviewed for other items, such as cost-effectiveness and ease of implementation. Once a vendor is selected, detailed design and specifications will be developed.

### $4.3$ SOLIDIFICATION/STABILIZATION TREATABILITY STUDIES

The first step in a treatability study for solidification/stabilization at SEAD-16 and 17 is to determine whether the soils and sediments to be remediated are already suitable for disposal in a Subtitle D landfill. If they are, then treatment, and a treatability study, are unnecessary. The primary criteria for disposal in a Subtitle D landfill are that the waste cannot be a RCRA hazardous waste, and characteristic wastes must be treated so they no longer exhibit hazardous characteristics. Soils at SEAD-16 and 17 will be tested for hazardous characteristics prior to implementing the treatability study.

Once the necessity for treatment has been determined, the next step is to establish the treatment objectives, which is related to the desired final compostion of the treated soils. In addition to meeting the criteria for disposal in a Subtitle D lanfill, the treatment objectives may include high structural strength. Typically, the design bearing strength is that which is required to support construction equipment during installation of the final landfill cover. Another objective to consider is the amount of volume increase. A S/S process that minimizes the volume increase of the treated soil is desirable because disposal costs are dependent on the volume of material to be disposed of. Other objectives may include one of more of the following:

- Determine the most economical mix design;
- Identify handling problems such as oversize material;
- Identify whether volatile emissions are a concern;
- Assess physical and chemical uniformity of the waste;

Once the treatment objectives are established, the next step is to determine the DOOs and prepare the workplan, which should include the treatment objectives and DOOs, in addition to the specific tests to be performed, a procedure for collecting a representative sample, and a procedure for arriving at the desired treatment objectives. A detailed discussion of treatability studies for S/S is contained in the USACE Technical Letter No. 1110-1-158, dated 28 February 1995, which should be consulted during preparation of the work plan.

Baseline conditions of the soil should be determined prior to treatability testing. A number of preliminary tests can be run on the soil to establish baseline conditions. These tests can include but are not limited to metals analysis, moisture content, percent solids, and density. In addition, because the primary objective of S/S is to immobilize contaminants in waste, leachability testing is necessary to predict how well contaminants will immoblize after S/S.

Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) is a common leachability test procedure, which involves mixing a portion of the solids with acetic acid to determine how much of the contaminants have leached into the acid over time (the complete procedure is described in EPA Test Methods SW-846, Method 1311). The TCLP is designed to simulate the leaching potential of a waste within an unmanaged landfill designed for municipal wastes, which can generate organic acids during decomposition of waste materials over time. However, the test does not simulate the conditions of most present-day hazardous waste landfills becuase these contain very little organic matter. Therefore, TCLP may not yield maximum concentrations of leached contaminants under all circumstances, and other leaching procedures should be considered. A partial summary of leaching procedures can be found in EPA/625/6-89/022.

After the workplan is completed, a representative sample must be collected. In order to adequately compare the results of each vendor's testing, it is best to collect a sufficient volume of sample for all the studies to be conducted. This volume should be based on the number of tests to be completed and the volume of soil required for each test. Homoginization and removal of oversize material by sieving are recommended to create uniform samples prior completing the treatability study.

November 1997

Page 4-6 k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc The next step is the treatability work itself. Often, the primary admixtures used are cement, lime (or lime kiln dust), and fly ash. These are used either individually or in varying mixtures of two or three. Most vendors also use proprietary admixtures. Therefore, the admixtures to be used in this treatability study will not be specified by the Army.

The admixtures will be added to the soil in varying ratios based on the dry weight of the soil. Water will be added as necessary, and the final volume of water added will be recorded. The mixtures will then be allowed to cure. At different times in the curing process, usually at 1 day, 3 days, 1 week, 2 weeks, and 1 month, the mixtures will tested to determine if the treatment criteria are met. These tests may include TCLP metals, bearing strength, volume increase, and moisture content. The actual testing schedule and parameter list will vary, depending on the vendor and the final disposition of the treated soil. Each vendor will then prepare a final report which documents all the results of the testing. The report will demonstrate which admixtures and curing times meet the treatment criteria. The Army will then evaluate the results to determine the most cost-effective of the admixtures which meet all the treatment criteria.

The results of the treatability study will then be used to prepare the final design and specifications. It is anticipated that the design will involve performance specifications geared towards meeting the treatment criteria, as opposed to design criteria which specify he admixtures to be used and the different ratios.

### 4.4 **SOIL WASHING TREATABILITY STUDIES**

The mechanics of the soil washing treatability study are very similar to those of the solidification/stabilization treatability study. Again, a DQOs and a work plan will be developed to describe the goals of the study. Representative samples will be collected. The pre-study testing will vary slightly for the soil washing treatability study. Preliminary data will include a full TCLP metals analysis to establish baseline conditions, and a number of physical chemical properties to aid in developing the treatment process. At a minimum, the soils will be analyzed for particle size distribution (sieve and hydrometer), dry bulk density, moisture content, total organic carbon, pH, and soil mineralogy.

November 1997

Page 4-7 k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc One important test which is run for the soil washing treatability study is a chemical analysis on each of several soil fractions separated with sieves. Often, most of the chemical constituents are associated with the fine fraction in the soil. When this is the case, wet separation unit operations can significantly reduce the quantity of soil which needs to be treated. By analyzing the different fractions prior to treatment, the distribution of the potentially hazardous constituents with respect to particle size can be determined.

The first step in the treatability study is usually a series of jar tests. Soil samples are placed in a series of jars, and an equal volume of liquid is added to each jar. Usually plain water (hot and cold) are the first liquids tested. Other liquids to test include aqueous solutions of surfactants, chelating agents, or other dispersing agents. The pH of the test water may also be varied. After the liquids are placed in the jars, the jars are shaken. Next, the soil/water mixture is poured into a 2mm sieve. The water is allowed to drain, and the remaining soil is rinsed with clean water. After the soil drys, it is analyzed to determine the percent reduction. The solutions which yield satisfactory results are carried over to the next stage of the study.

The bench-scale testing is more involved than the jar tests. The first step is often to determine the optimal wash times, washwater to soil ratios, and rinsewater to washwater ratios (EPA, 1991b). Once these values are determined with plain water, the optimal additives determined in the jar testing stage can be used. Each of the other additives can be evaluated to determine the solution which best removes hazardous constituents from the coarse fraction. If the acid leaching process is used to treat the fine fraction to remove inorganic components, these agents will also be analyzed to determine whether they are effective for solubilizing metal contaminants and to determine if the process meets the remediation requirements established for the site. The wash water and rinse water will also be analyzed for mass balance purposes, and for determining the best treatment and disposal option for the washwater. If necessary, treatability testing will be conducted on the washwater.

The last step is evaluating the results of the treatability study. Analytical data taken before and after the washing are used to determine the removal efficiency. The particle size distributions can be used to estimate the volume reduction of the process. The effectiveness of the washwater treatment and fine soil separation must also be considered. These results will then be used to size

November 1997

Page 4-8 k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc the final unit, specify the reagents and reagent ratios, and prepare a detailed cost estimate for the process.

 $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ 

November 1997

Page 4-9<br>k:\SENECA\S16&17FS\text\SECTION4.doc

### DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES  $5.0$

### $5.1$ **GENERAL**

The four retained remedial action alternatives for soil/sediment represent a range of waste management strategies which address the human health and environmental concerns associated with SEAD-16 and 17. Although the selected alternative(s) will be further refined as necessary during the predesign phase, the description of the alternatives and the analysis with respect to the criteria discussed below present the fundamental components of the various alternatives being considered for this site.

A technical description of each alternative is presented. After the technical description, a discussion of the alternative is presented with respect to overall protection of human health and the environment; short-term effectiveness; long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; implementability; and cost.

The analysis of each alternative with respect to overall protection of human health and the environment provides an evaluation of how the alternative reduces the risk from potential exposure pathways and meets the site-specific cleanup goals established between NYSDEC, the USEPA, and the Army through treatment, engineering, or institutional controls. These goals, presented in Table 2-2 were developed for on-site soils and sediments.

Long-term effectiveness and permanence are evaluated with respect to the magnitude of residual risk remaining from untreated waste or treated residuals after the remedial action is complete, and the adequacy and reliability of controls used to manage remaining waste (untreated waste and treatment residuals) over the long-term. One requirement of CERCLA is that a remedial action should involve solutions with the highest degrees of long-term effectiveness and permanence. That is, little or no waste would remain at the site such that long-term maintenance and monitoring are unnecessary and reliance on institutional controls is minimized.

The discussion of the reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment addresses the anticipated performance of the treatment technologies involved with an alternative. This evaluation relates to one of the requirements by CERCLA that a selected remedial action employ treatment to reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of hazardous substances. The evaluation will determine the amount of waste treated or destroyed, the reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume, and the type and quantity of treatment residuals that will remain.

Evaluation of alternatives with respect to short-term effectiveness takes into account protection of workers and the community during the remedial action, environmental impacts from implementing the action, and the time required to achieve cleanup goals.

The analysis of implementability deals with the technical and administrative feasibility of implementing the alternatives and the availability of necessary materials and services. This criteria includes the ability to construct and operate components of the alternatives; the availability of adequate off-site treatment, storage, and disposal services; the availability of services, equipment, and specialists; the ability to monitor the effectiveness of remedial actions; and the ability to obtain necessary approvals from agencies.

Detailed the cost estimates presented in this report for the retained alternatives. These costs are based on information from the R.S. means Environmental Cost Handling Options and Solutions (ECHOS) estimating library. Ouotes from suppliers in the area of the site, generic unit costs, vendor information, conventional cost estimating guides, and prior experience are used to supplement this information. The cost estimates presented in this feasibility report have been prepared for guidance in project evaluation. The actual costs of the project will depend on true labor and materials costs at the time of construction, actual site conditions, competitive market condition, final project scope, and other variables.

Construction costs include those expenditures required to implement a remedial action. Both direct and indirect costs are considered in the development of construction cost estimates. Direct costs include construction costs or expenditures for equipment, labor, and materials required to implement a remedial action. Indirect costs include those associated with engineering, permitting, construction management, and other services necessary to carry out a remedial action.

Quarterly O&M costs, which include labor, maintenance materials, and purchased services have also been determined.

The detailed analysis of alternatives considers all the receptors identified in Section 2.0 for each exposure scenario: current and future on-site industrial worker, future construction worker, and future potential trespasser. SEDA has been placed on the base closure list for BRAC95 and the intended future use is industrial/commercial. Therefore, the purpose of the remedial action objectives established in Section 2.0 is to protect human health as appropriate to the intended future use of SEAD-16 and 17. Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 have therefore been retained for detailed analysis in this section because they have the best potential for fulfilling the remedial action objectives. Alternative 1 (No Action) has also been retained for comparison purposes. The primary components of each alternative are shown in Table  $5-1.$ 

## Table 5-1 SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY **SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY**

# REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES RETAINED FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS



### ANALYSIS OF SOIL/SEDIMENT ALTERNATIVE 1: NO ACTION  $5.2$

### $5.2.1$ **Definition of Alternative 1**

The no action alternative means that no remedial activities will be undertaken at SEAD-16 and 17. No monitoring or security measures will be undertaken. Any attenuation of the threats posed by the site to human health and the environment will be the result of natural processes. Current security measures, which include the SEDA-wide security activities that effectively eliminate public access to the area, will be eliminated or modified depending upon whether the property is transferred or leased. Access to the site can be limited depending upon how the Army determines the property will be used.

This alternative will be used as a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives developed as part of this feasibility study.

## $5.2.2$ **Protection of Human Health and the Environment**

An evaluation of the protectiveness of human health and the environment includes an assessment of the short-term and long-term effectiveness as well as permanence. Assessment of the short-term effectiveness addresses the effects of an alternative during construction and implementation of a remedial action. Since Alternative 1 is a no action alternative, which does not require construction or disturbances to the site, analysis of short term effectiveness is not applicable.

### $5.2.2.1$ **Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence**

The Baseline Risk Assessment (BRA) indicates that the no action alternative is currently within the EPA target range for carcinogenic risk for both SEAD-16 and SEAD-17. However, the total site noncarcinogenic risk, or hazard index HI, for the future industrial worker scenario was determined to be 19.6 at SEAD-16, which is above the EPA target value of 1.0. In addition, the HI for the future on-site construction worker scenario was determined to be 2.22, which is also above the EPA target value. The hazard indices for all scenarios at SEAD-17 are below the EPA target value of 1.0 (refer to Table 1-2). Therefore, the no action alternative is only protective of human health at SEAD-17.

However, this alternative does not protect against ingestion of and direct contact with soils having concentrations of lead above 500 mg/kg, or prevent potential leaching of lead from the soil into the groundwater above the federal action level. All of the constituents of concern remain in-place. Since the SEDA security measures prevent public access to the site, there is currently little or no risk to the public because there is not exposure. Access by site workers is infrequent and limited to demilitarization

activities. SEDA personnel working at SEAD-16 or SEAD-17 have also received training which will allow them to operate safely in the areas near the site. However, since the depot is a facility scheduled to be closed under BRAC95, these security measures will eventually be eliminated. The future land use of the site is designated as industrial/commercial.

Furthermore, this alternative does not provide long-term protection to ecological receptors in Kendaia Creek because the sediments in the drainage ditches with concentrations of lead above the NYSDEC criteria would remain. While no adverse affects were observed during the RI, there is a potential for long-term chronic affects. Contamination of the creek by runoff from the site would not be prevented.

The no action alternative does not provide a permanent solution since no treatment, engineering or institutional controls are provided to prevent exposure to constituents of concern in on-site soils and sediments.

### 5.2.3 **Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume**

There would be no reduction in the toxicity, mobility, or volume of the impacted soil at the sites. Some natural attenuation is expected, through dispersal of the affected soil and through chemical and physical changes which may reduce the mobility of the heavy metals. However, these decreases will be minimal, since no reduction from treatment will occur.

### $5.2.4$ Implementability

The criteria of implementability is not applicable to the no action alternative since there are no activities occurring. There will still be monitoring and security activities, as described above, as well as some administrative requirements, but these activities which are already occurring are and will continue to be performed as part of compliance with RCRA. Formal RCRA closure activities may require additional remedial measures if necessary.

### 5.2.5 Cost

There are no costs associated with the no action alternative. The costs associated with the monitoring and security described above are covered through other mechanisms, and will not be directly attributable to this remedial action.

## 5.3

# SOIL/SEDIMENT ALTERNATIVES 4 THROUGH 6: COMMON **COMPONENTS**

All of the remaining alternatives have five components in common. These components, which are in addition to the remediation criteria for soils and sediments required by NYSDEC and the USEPA, include groundwater monitoring, runoff prevention, site revegetation, periodic monitoring of the sediments in Kendaia Creek, and UXO clearance. A detailed description of each component is provided below.

- Site groundwater will be monitored on a quarterly basis. There are a number of wells already installed at the site, and these may be sufficient for the continued monitoring. New wells will be installed as necessary to ensure that the monitoring program is sufficient to detect any migration from the area.
- Sediment sampling in Kendaia Creek will be conducted on an annual basis at four location within the reach affected by the drainage ditches at SEAD-16 and 17. The purpose of the sampling is to ensure that Kendaia Creek is not being contaminated by lead left in the soil at the site.

## ANALYSIS OF SOIL/SEDIMENT ALTERNATIVE 4: EXCAVATION, TREATMENT,  $5.4$ AND OFF-SITE LANDFILL

### **Definition of Alternative 4**  $5.4.1$

### $5.4.1.1$ **Description**

This alternative includes excavation of soils, treatment of soils exceeding the TCLP limit to remove the characteristic of toxicity, and disposal of all the excavated soils, sediments, and treated soils in an offsite, non-hazardous, solid waste, Subtitle D, industrial landfill. For this alternative, the soils and sediment with concentrations of lead exceeding TCLP limit will be treated by a solidification/stabilization process prior to disposal in a Subtitle D landfill. This treatment will be conducted either on site or off site at a TSD facility. All the soils will be transported off-site to a Subtitle D solid waste landfill for disposal. Each of the processes involved with this alternative will be described briefly in this section. A detailed analysis of how this option meets the selection criteria, and a budgetary cost estimate are provided below.

The first step in this alternative is excavation. An excavation plan will be developed using previous RI data to delineate the extent of removal.

These volumes includes approximately 10 cy of debris and materials from the abandoned building at SEAD-16, surface and subsurface soils with lead concentrations that exceed 500 mg/kg, and sediments that exceed the NYSDEC sediment criteria for lead of 31 mg/kg. The excavation will be accomplished with standard construction equipment, such as a front end loader or bulldozer.

The data indicate that the soils to be removed at SEAD-16 (case 2) are limited to soils on the northeast, east, south, and southeast sides of Building S-311, as shown on Figure 2-1 in Section 2.0. At SEAD-17, the soils to be removed (case 1) include surface soils on the north, northwest, and west side of Building 367 (Figure 2-2). These soils will be removed to a depth of 6 inches below ground surface, comprising 675 cubic yards (CY) to be excavated at SEAD-16 and 842 CY to be excavated at SEAD-17, for a combined total of 1,517 CY for both sites. The cumulative total is 1,617 CY. The excavated soil will be loaded into trucks for transport to an off-site treatment, storage and disposal facility (TSDF), which will be responsible for the necessary treatment (solidification/stabilization) for disposal in an off-site solid waste landfill. Alternatively the soil can be treated on-site, in which case the excavated soil will be brought to an on-site pug mill.

The next case of soils to be excavated (case 3 for SEAD-16 case 2 for SEAD-17) are sediments in the drainage ditches that exceed the NYSDEC sediment criteria of 31 mg/kg for lead. Since lead was detected above this level in all sediment samples, six inches of sediment will be excavated from all drainage ditches at each site, according to the areas delineated on Figures 2-1 and 2-2. The volume of sediment to be excavated at SEAD-16 and 17 is 371 CY and 81 CY, respectively. The combined total is 452 CY for a cumulative total excavated and removed at both sites of 2,069 CY.

At isolated locations, subsurface sample results showed elevated lead concentrations exceeding the 500 mg/kg criteria. Soil at these isolated locations will be further excavated to a depth of 24 inches. The volume of soil involved with this case (Case 4 at SEAD-16 and Case 3 at SEAD-17) is 76 CY and 35 CY, respectively, for a combined total of 165 CY. The cumulative volume of soils to be excavated for all cases at SEAD-16 and 17 is 1,222 CY and 958 CY, respectively, or a combined total of 2,180 CY.

Each site will be regraded with a bulldozer in a manner which approximates the original grade. If necessary, clean fill will be brought in to make up for the excavated soils. The topsoil will be vegetated with indigenous grasses as an erosion control measure.

The next step in this alternative is the solidification/stabilization treatment step, which can be accomplished either on or off site. Because the small volume of soils that require remediation at SEAD-16 and 17, it is expected that off-site treatment is more cost effective. However, both options will be considered. Solidification/stabilization is a process in which a setting agent is added to the soil to form a

mixture which entraps the constituents. Solidification refers to the techniques use to encapsulate hazardous waste into a solid material, and stabilization generally refers to the techniques that treat hazardous wastes by converting them into a less soluble, mobile, or toxic state. The different setting agents used are described below. The primary goals of solidification are to:

Improve the handling and physical characteristics of the waste

Decrease constituent solubility and mobility

Decrease the surface area across which the migration of constituents may occur.

The reason for stabilizing the soil is to immobilize the lead and other heavy metals in the soils that have concentrations of constituents in excess of the TCLP regulatory limits. Excavated soil must be tested for TCLP to determine the necessity for solidification/stabilization prior to disposal. Once this is accomplished the stabilized material can be disposed of as a solid waste in an on-site landfill.

Solidification/stabilization is a process in which the contaminants are converted to less toxic, mobile, and/or in soluble forms. The physical properties of the soil or waste are not necessarily changed by this process (EPA 1990).

Solidification/stabilization has been used primarily for the treatment of soils containing inorganic contaminants and has been shown to be effective for heavy metals, the primary contaminant of concern at SEAD-16 and 17. Some organics may interfere with the setting process, and others may not be bound up in the finished product. There are few organics in the soils to be stabilized at SEAD-16 and 17, and interference by organics is not considered to be a problem. Bench scale treatability tests will be conducted to assess the adequacy of a given additive to a specific soil-waste mixture.

types of mixtures are generally used for solidification/stabilization. Four Inorganic solidification/stabilization is often achieved with cement or pozzolanic additives. Organic solidification/stabilization is often accomplished with thermo-plastic or organic polymerization additives (EPA, 1989). A combination of these processes may be used for a soil containing both organic and inorganic contaminants.

In cement-based solidification/stabilization, the soil is mixed with Portland cement. Water is added to Inorganic materials then become bound up in the cement matrix. the mixture. Pozzolanic solidification/stabilization involves mixing the waste with a siliceous material, such as fly ash, pumice, or lime kiln dust. The mixture is often combined with lime or cement and water to form a cement-like final product. The end result of inorganic solidification/stabilization can be a granular material or a cohesive solid (EPA, 1989). Cement-based stabilization is the likely choice for SEAD-16 and 17. The site soils are primarily fill material, much of which consists of crushed shale. This material will be readily bound up in a cement base, and will act like the aggregate used in making concrete. Treatability testing will be conducted to determine the quantities and types of admixtures which best satisfy the treatment criteria for this site.

Solidification/stabilization can be conducted either in-situ or in a batch mode. For in-situ solidification/stabilization, the mixtures are injected into the soil and then mixed. Farm equipment such as tillers can be used in this process. In batch operations, the material is removed from the ground with standard earthmoving equipment and mixed in units such as standard cement trucks. The solidified material is then replaced in the ground. Batch processes require more area than in situ processes because space is necessary to store the untreated soil when it is removed from the ground. For on-site treatment at SEAD-16 and 17, a batch operation will be used. The contaminated soil is shallow, and is easily removed. In addition, there is plenty of space available to set up a stockpile area and cement plant. The treated soil could be placed directly into trucks for removal to the off-site landfill.

The final step in this remedial action is disposal of all the soils and sediments including the treated material. The treated soils and remaining excavated soils and sediments will not be considered a characteristic RCRA hazardous waste. It will be a solid waste, and therefore disposal will be subject to RCRA Subtitle D and New York State solid waste regulations. In New York, all sanitary landfills are authorized to accept industrial wastes, and therefore would be able to accept the stabilized soil. These landfills cannot accept hazardous waste, and require extensive testing to assure that the waste is no a hazardous waste. The actual testing requirements vary from landfill to landfill, and the exact requirements for this remedial action will be specified once a landfill is selected.

Two landfills, which may be used for this remedial action, have been identified. The first is EO located in Michigan. This facility has the capacity and capability to treat and dispose hazardous material. The second is the Seneca Meadows landfill located in Waterloo, New York, approximately 10 to 15 miles from the site. This facility however, cannot treat the soil and can only be used if the soil is treated onsite.

### 5.4.1.2 **Process Flow and Site Layout**

Figure 5-1 is a process flow diagram for Alternative 4 (and 5). The process flow for this alternative consists of three steps. First, the soil is excavated and TCLP tested as described above. Soils exceeding the TCLP criteria are placed in trucks and hauled to the TSDF. If on-site treatment is used, soils are brought to an on-site pug mill where it is stockpiled prior to stabilization. If the material is sent off-site for treatment, the soil will be treated and then disposed of in an appropriate landfill. If treatment will









take place on-site, the soil will be placed in the pug mill and mixed with water and the various admixtures. The soil likely will be placed in the pug mill using a conveyor belt with a scale system in order to record the weight of the soil to be treated. Another option is a front end loader, with the volume of the treated soil recorded, the admixtures may be added in several ways, depending on the final technology selected. Dry admixtures will either be stockpiled and added via a conveyor or a front end loader, or added with a hopper system. If water is necessary to the process, either a temporary tank will be used, or depending on the location, a hook up to the Depot water supply may be possible.

The treated soil is then discharged either directly to the trucks for transport to the landfill, or to a treated soil stockpile for testing. In general, a volume increase of 50% is expected for the solidified soil. The treated soil will be analyzed by the TCLP at the rate required by the landfill accepting the waste. For the Seneca Meadows Landfill, the rate required is one TCLP analysis per 1,500 tons of treated soil. In the final step, all the soils are transported to the off-site solid waste landfill.

This alternative does not require much area, only sufficient area for the pug mill and two small stockpile areas if treatment is conducted on site. Once the system is operational, there will only need to be room in each stockpile for 1,000 to 2,000 tons. The pug mill and stockpile area will be located adjacent to Unnamed Road between SEAD-16 and 17, as shown on Figure 5-2. This will provide for easy access for the excavation equipment to bring the untreated soil to the pug mill, and for the trucks which will haul the treated material to the landfill.

If treatment is conducted off-site, each truck will be loaded directly from the excavations. A small staging area and equipment decontamination area will be set up as necessary.

### $5.4.2$ Protection of Human Health and the Environment

An evaluation of the protectiveness of human health and the environment includes the assessment of short- and long-term effectiveness as well as permanence. The following discussion will show how this alternative meets these criteria.

### $5.4.2.1$ **Short-term Protectiveness**

This alternative will be evaluated with respect to the effect on human health and the environment during the implementation of the remedial action. Four items are included in an assessment of the short-term protectiveness of Alternative 4. The first issue is protection of the community during the remedial action. If no treatment will be accomplished on site, there will be transport of hazardous material. Care will be taken to assure that the trucks are not overloaded. The soils will be covered with a tarp during




transport to ensure that no dust is released from the trucks. If all treatment will be accomplished on site. this alternative is very protective of the community. There will be transport of no hazardous materials. All waste which is sent to the off-site landfill will no longer be considered hazardous waste.

There is also a minor threat from dust released during the excavation. The site is located far from the SEDA boundary, so the likelihood of any hazardous dust migrating off-site is negligible. As discussed in Section 5 of the RI report, fugitive dust migration is not a major migration pathway. Fugitive dust is further minimized by the makeup of the soil to be excavated, which are primarily shale fill, a material which has a fairly large particle size, and is less subject to dust formation.

The short-term protectiveness to site workers must also be considered. The major routes of exposure during treatment are direct contact with the contaminated soil and inhalation of vapors or particulates. Protection from exposure can be minimized through site access controls and the use of proper protective equipment for site workers, such as dust masks and Tyvek protective clothing. Air monitoring may be used to determine if there is a significant threat from the inhalation of vapors or particulate. Dust generation at the excavation can be minimized by using water or other dust control chemicals. During on-site treatment, dust generation can be minimized at the pug mill by containing all admixtures which tend to from dust (ie., cement and lime), and by containing the mixing process. The solidification/ stabilization process is very similar to normal cement construction procedures, and is therefore fairly straightforward. It should also be noted that all the site workers will be required to meet all the OSHA training and medical monitoring requirements prior to working on site.

Another part of the short-term protectiveness criterion is assessing the environmental impacts during the remedial action. For Alternative 4, there will be little or no environmental impacts. This alternative calls for construction type activities in an active portion of the Depot. These activities will not be substantially different from what is currently occurring. In addition, since the hazardous material is primarily in the soil, there is little or no risk of a spill or release during the remedial action.

The last item to be considered is the time until treatment is accomplished. Alternative 4 should be completed in a brief period of time. If treatment is conducted on site, the initial treatability testing and vendor selection should take two to three months. Once the treatability testing is completed and a vendor is selected, the mobilization time should be less than one month, since no specialized equipment is required. All of the equipment used is standard construction equipment. Little permitting will be required, and operations should begin quickly. The remedial action would take one to two months, depending primarily on the time needed for the solidified soil to cure. Once the solidification was finished, and the treated soil landfilled off-site, the remedial action would be complete.

If treatment is conducted at an off site TSDF, this alternative will take one to two months to complete. depending on the weather, because it would be a "dig and haul" operation. There is little mobilization, since only a loader, and maybe a scraper are necessary to accomplish the excavation. It would only take one to two days to set up a staging area and construct an equipment decontamination pad. Once the soil is removed, the remedial action would be complete.

#### **Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence** 5.4.2.2

The assessment of the long-term effectiveness of can be divided into two major categories, an assessment of the magnitude of the residual risk, and an evaluation of the adequacy and reliability of the controls used for the waste residuals and untreated soil.

The magnitude of the residual risk is easy to quantify. The removal plan for the soils will be designed such that the remaining soils demonstrate a concentration of lead below 500 mg/kg and sediments demonstrate lead concentrations below 31 mg/kg. There will be no treatment residuals left at the site, so the treatment residuals will not be included in the risk evaluation. All of the excavated soils will be hauled off-site, treated, and disposed of in an off-site Subtitle D landfill.

The controls to be used for long-term management are also easy to assess. No residuals will remain on site. The long-term management will be left to the landfill selected for receiving the treated and remaining excavated soils. It will be important to select a well run landfill in order to assure that the landfill will be managed and closed in accordance with State and Federal requirements. The treated material is not a RCRA hazardous waste, so there should be little risk associated with offsite disposal. The landfills considered for this remedial action do not accept hazardous wastes.

As described above, there will be no long-term maintenance required at the site. Any exposed areas will be regraded to minimize erosion potential. Any areas in which soil was removed below grade will be backfilled with clean soil. A cover of native vegetation will be established as an additional erosion control measure, but once the cover is established, maintenance activities will no longer be required.

The permanence of the alternative must also be assessed. Once the treated and remaining excavated soils are removed from the site, the remedial action would be considered permanent. There will no longer be soil on the site that poses an unacceptable threat to human health. There is some question about the permanence of the solidification/stabilization treatment technology. In general, the solidified soil, as with all concrete, is subject to weathering from freeze-thaw and wet-dry cycles. If the material is safely placed in a secure landfill, the material will be protected from weathering, and there would be no degradation of the concrete, which indicates that the treatment will be permanent.

Permanence is further enhanced by the use of stabilizing agents, such as lime. The lime reacts with the heavy metals to form insoluble carbonates and hydroxides. These products are far less soluble than the free metals, and are very resistant to weathering.

#### 5.4.2.3 Conclusion

Alternative 4 would protect human health and the environment. This alternative protects against ingestion of and direct contact with surface soils having concentrations of lead above 500 mg/kg and sediment with lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg.

The results of the baseline risk assessment show that conditions at SEAD-16 require a remedial action (see Section 2.0). Removal of Case 2 and Case 4 soils at SEAD-16 will reduce risk from soils to acceptable levels. At SEAD-17, though the risk assessment shows that conditions at the site do not require remedial action, removal of Case 1 and Case 3 soils will reduce the HI and carcinogenic risk to lower levels. Therefore, this alternative meets the RAOs by reducing risk, thus protecting human health.

This alternative also meets the NYSDEC sediment criteria established for lead in site sediments not to exceed 31 mg/kg. The sediments with concentrations of lead above the sediment criteria will be removed, which will meet the RAO for sediment and prevent contamination downgradient in Kendaia Creek.

#### 5.4.3 Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume

Overall, Alternative 4 would be effective in reducing the toxicity and mobility of the hazardous constituents present in the soil at the site. Assessing the volume reduction is somewhat more difficult. The treated soil will have a larger volume than the untreated soil, but the treated soil will no longer be a hazardous waste. In general, a volume increase of 50% for the treated soil can be expected. Furthermore, excavation of the remaining soils and sediments would increase the volume by approximately 20% from a total of 2,180 cy to 2,586 cy for both sites.

The decrease in toxicity and mobility can be assessed on both a small scale and site-wide basis. On the small scale, both the toxicity and mobility of the hazardous constituents in the soil are assessed with the TCLP test. The larger the leaching fraction, the greater the mobility and the greater the toxicity. Since the primary treatment criteria for solidification/stabilization is that the waste no longer be TC hazardous, the treated waste will exhibit lower toxicity and mobility than the untreated waste. The mass of the potentially hazardous constituents in the soil will remain unchanged.

In addition, by treating the soil which contains the highest concentrations of hazardous constituents, the overall site risk (toxicity) will be reduced to acceptable levels. By solidifying the soil, and then transferring all the soils and sediments to a landfill, the mobility of the hazardous constituents will be effectively reduced. A properly managed Subtitle D landfill does not allow for uncontrolled releases from the landfill. The treated soil will be the only treatment residual.

#### 5.4.4 Implementability

A discussion of implementability can be divided into three sections, technical feasibility, administrative feasibility, and availability of services and materials. Technical feasibility describes items such as construction and operation, technology reliability, and monitoring considerations. Administrative feasibility addresses issues such as permitting, interaction with NYSDEC and EPA, and community relations. Availability of services and materials describes the ease of obtaining vendors and equipment, and the availability of offsite disposal capacity.

#### $5.4.4.1$ **Technical Feasibility**

The overall technical feasibility of Alternative 4 is very good. Solidification/stabilization is a technology which has been frequently used to treat similar soils, and it is not anticipated that problems will be encountered during construction, as long as the proper treatability work has been completed to establish the optimal admixture ratios. Since the materials and equipment used are all standard construction equipment, the process can be operated in almost all weather conditions. If treatment is conducted off site, the TSD facilities in the region have accepted similar wastes for a number of years. These facilities are fully capable of treating and disposing of the site soils.

The excavation process is also well defined. The areas demonstrating elevated concentrations of heavy metals have been delineated, and it will be straightforward to develop an excavation plan that assures all areas with high concentrations are removed. It is possible that some minor weather delays may be encountered, but most of the soil to be removed is located above grade, and should not be adversely affected by wet conditions.

Another aspect of technical feasibility is the ease with which additional work may be conducted. At this time, it is anticipated that this remedial action will preclude the necessity of any additional remedial efforts for soil at SEAD-16 and 17. However, if additional work is required in the future, this remedial action will not interfere in any way. Once the remedial action is complete, the sites will be revegetated, and will essentially remain as they are now with the possible exception of the abandoned buildings at SEAD-16, which are discussed separately in this report.

Several monitoring requirements govern the solidification/stabilization process. The additives must be properly metered into the soil to assure proper treatment. The soil which has been treated must be tested to ensure that the contaminants have been stabilized. Air monitoring will likely be necessary to determine if movement of the soil is releasing constituents to the air.

#### 5.4.4.2 **Administrative Feasibility**

The administrative feasibility of this alternative is also very good. Since there will only be a temporary treatment facility on site if treatment is conducted on-site, no hazardous waste permitting will be required. Construction permits necessary for the activities are readily attainable. In addition, there will be no transport of hazardous waste, greatly simplifying the manifest requirements. Since the wastes will be sent to a permitted disposal facility, no disposal permits will be necessary.

If treatment is conducted off site, the TSDFs which may be used for offsite treatment, are fully permitted. There will be some transport of hazardous waste, and proper manifests will be required. All of the contractors used for excavation and hauling will be experienced in preparing manifests.

Coordination with the various regulatory agencies is also important. As described above, the Army has coordinated the entire remedial program with both EPA and NYSDEC, and will consider input from both these agencies in the final remedy selection. It is anticipated that any issues arising with the regulatory agencies will be addressed prior to remedy selection.

#### 5.4.4.3 **Availability of Services and Materials**

This technology relies primarily on standard equipment, which is readily available in the Romulus area, since the equipment consists primarily of farm and construction equipment. The excavation would be accomplished with backhoes and scrapers, and the material would be transported in standard size dumptrucks. For on-site treatment, the stabilization unit would consist of a temporary pug mill.

Startup time to implement solidification/stabilization is one to two months, depending on the level of effort necessary for treatability testing. Bench-scale tests will likely be necessary to determine the proper additives and ratios of additives to contaminated soil. These must be brought to the site along with the earth moving and mixing equipment. Total treatment time for sites such as SEAD-16 and 17 is approximately two to four months, including the treatability studies.

The availability of permitted hazardous waste TSD facilities which could accept the soils from this site should be considered. One facility, EQ located in Michigan, has sufficient capacity to accept the soils from this site for both treatment and disposal.

The last issue to consider is if the soils are treated on-site, the availability of Subtitle D landfills to accept the excavated and solidified soils. The Seneca Meadows landfill indicate that they had sufficient capacity to accept the waste, and would be willing to accept the waste if the proper analytical results were provided.

5.4.5 Cost

#### 5.4.5.1 **Capital Costs**

The total capital cost for this alternative is estimated to be \$410,600 if treatment is conducted off site and \$612,900 if treatment is conducted on-site. There is some uncertainty associated with there estimates. The cost backup for this alternative is presented in Appendix D, which includes the general assumed scope and all assumptions made.

#### O & M Costs 5.4.5.2

O & M costs associated with Alternative 4 include costs for quarterly groundwater sampling. The annual O & M cost is estimated to be \$41,688. Once the remedial action is completed, there will be no residuals remaining at either site that require management. Initially, there will be some minor costs associated with the establishment of the vegetative cover, but the cost estimate for these items have been included in the capital costs.

#### **Present Worth Costs** 5.4.5.3

The present worth costs for Alternative 4 are estimated to be \$773,110 for on-site stabilization and \$570,784 for offsite stabilization.

5.5 **ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE**  $5:$ **EXCAVATION,** SOLIDIFICATION/ **STABILIZATION** OF SOILS FAILING TCLP CRITERIA, AND ON-SITE **LANDFILLING** 

#### 5.5.1 **Definition of Alternative 5**

#### 5.5.1.1 **Description**

This alternative includes excavation and removal of Case 1 through Case 4 soils, and materials ate SEAD-16 and Case 1 through Case 3 soils at SEAD-17 (see Tables 2-1 and 2-2), treatment of soils with TCLP exceedences, and disposal of both the treated and untreated soils in an on-site solid waste (Subtitle D) landfill. For this alternative, soils with concentrations of lead exceeding the TCLP limit will be treated by a solidification/stabilization process prior to disposal. TCLP testing and treatment will be conducted on-site. Each of the processes involved with this alternative will be described briefly in this section. A detailed analysis of how this option meets the selection criteria and a budgetary cost estimate are also provided below.

The first step in this option is excavation. An excavation plan will be developed using previous RI data to delineate the extent of removal. In general, the materials to be excavated are soils and sediments as described in Section 2.0 and presented in Table 2-1 and Table 2-2. The soil and material volumes to be excavated are the same as described in Section 5.4.1.1 for Alternative 4. The excavation will be accomplished with standard construction equipment, such as a front end loader or bulldozer.

The combined total volume of material be excavated at SEAD-16 and 17 is 2,700 CY. The locations of the areas to be excavated are shown on Figures 2-1 and 2-2. The excavated soil will be brought to the pug mill where it will be stockpiled prior to stabilization. The solidification/stabilization process is described in detail in the description of Alternative 4, Section 5.4.1.1.

After the excavation, the sites will be regraded with a bulldozer in a manner which approximates the original grade. If necessary, clean fill will be brought in to make up for the soils excavated. The topsoil cover will be vegetated with indigenous grasses as an erosion control measure.

After the solidification/stabilization process, the final step in the remedial action is disposal of the remaining soils and sediments. This remaining material will not be considered a characteristic RCRA hazardous waste after solidification/stabilization. It will be a solid waste subject to RCRA Subtitle D and New York State solid waste regulations. There are no landfills on SEDA property which meet the current New York State Subtitle D requirements. Therefore, a landfill meeting these requirements will need to be constructed for this remedial action.

The requirements for the construction of a Subtitle D landfill are summarized below. The following discussion will focus on several of the key design issues which are useful in evaluating the feasibility of this alternative, and which are necessary in developing a budgetary cost estimate.

The NYSDEC requirements for Subtitle D landfills are described in 6 NYCRR Part 360. These landfills are required to be constructed such that the bottom of the lowest liner is a minimum of five feet above the seasonal high water table and 10 feet above bedrock. Since the seasonal high water table at the SEAD-16 and 17 is only three to four feet below the ground surface, it would be necessary to build the landfill completely above grade, if the landfill is located close to the sites. Approximately two feet of fill would be required below the base of the landfill.

In general NYSDEC requires a double composite liner system with a leak detection layer in between the two liners. As defined in 6 NYCRR 360-2.13, a composite liner consists of "two components, an upper geomembrane liner placed directly above a low permeability soil layer." The soil component of the upper liner must have a minimum compacted thickness of 18 inches. The soil component of the lower liner must have a minimum compacted thickness of 24 inches, and a maximum permeability of  $1 \times 10^{-7}$ centimeters per second (cm/s). There are also a number of compaction, construction, and slope requirements.

In 6 NYCRR 360-2.14, there are separate provisions for industrial landfills. In particular, this section specifies that the above requirements may be modified on a case by case basis. Specifically, the requirements for a double composite liner may be waived. One example given is the case of an ash monofill, in which only a single composite liner is required. A landfill constructed with solidified waste from SEAD-16 and 17 would be similar to an ash monofill, therefore it is likely that the double liner requirement could be waived for this remedial action. As stated in 6 NYCRR 360-2.14, this alternative liner system must demonstrate its ability to adequately present a negative impact on groundwater quality and must address all the factors specified in Section  $360-214(a)(1)$ . The following discussion and cost estimate assumes that only a single composite liner will be required at the site. A full discussion of the cost impacts of the different liner requirements is provided below.

Typically, the next layer up from the liner system is the leachate collection system. The leachate collection system generally consists of one foot of high permeability soil, such as sand, with a network of pipes. The sand and pipe system may be replaced with a geosynthetic drainage layer, providing that the geosynthetic layer has a hydraulic transmissivity equivalent to one foot of sand. The leachate collection

system is sloped such that any accumulated liquid collects in a sump from which it can be pumped out. Once the landfill is full and properly closed, there should be no leachate generation. At SEAD-16 and 17, depending on the final location of the landfill, a geosynthetic layer would likely be used in order to minimize the height of the above grade landfill.

After the leachate collection system, clean fill is placed in order to protect the leachate collection system. The waste is then placed on top of the protective soil. Once the filling is complete the landfill is ready for closure. The final cover consists of a low permeability soil layer overlain by a protective soil layer. Typical thicknesses for these layers are 18 and 24 inches. The cover is sloped to allow for drainage. It is also necessary to establish vegetation on the cover to minimize erosion. The final configuration will be determined during the remedial design stage is this alternative is chosen.

There are additional requirements for gas venting systems and groundwater monitoring. Gas venting systems may not be required for SEAD-16 and 17 soils since there are no putrescible wastes, which would generate gas. If gas venting systems are required, they are expected to be simple. Groundwater monitoring is accomplished by placing a number of wells around the landfill into the uppermost water bearing zone. There are wells already installed at both sites as part of the RI, so it should be necessary to install only a few wells.

The regulations require that post-closure care and monitoring be conducted for a minimum of thirty years. In general, the maintenance required is for erosion control, pest control, and maintenance of the vegetative cover. The wells must also be sampled on a regular basis. Any releases from the landfill must be addressed accordingly.

#### 5.5.1.2 **Process Flow**

The process flow for this alternative consists of three steps, excavation, stabilization, and on-site landfilling. Figure 5-1 is a process flow diagram for the solidification/stabilization process for this alternative (and for Alternative 4). The process is fairly simple. The soil to be treated is excavated, and brought to the pug mill where it is stockpiled prior to stabilization. Soils which have been previously determined to bypass the treatment step one excavated separately. The soil to be treated is then placed in the pug mill and mixed with water and the various admixtures. The soil likely will be placed in the pug mill using a conveyor belt with a scale system in order to record the weight of the soil to be treated. Another option is a front end loader, with the volume of the treated soil recorded. The admixtures may be added in several ways, depending on the final technology selected. Dry admixtures will either be stockpiled and added via a conveyor or a front end loader, or added with a hopper system. If water is necessary to the process, either a temporary tank will be used, or depending on the location, a hook up to the Depot water supply may be possible.

The treated soil is discharged either directly to the trucks for transport to the landfill, or to a treated soil stockpile for testing. In general, a volume increase of 50% is expected for the solidified soil. The treated soil will be analyzed by the TCLP at the rate required by NYSDEC. For existing offsite Subtitle landfills, the rate required is one TCLP analysis per 150 tons of treated soil.

In the final step, the treated soils and excavated soils that did not require treatment are placed in an onsite landfill.

#### 5.5.1.3 **Site Layout**

This alternative requires approximately 6 acres for the on-site landfill in addition to sufficient area for the pug mill and two small stockpile areas. Once the system is operational, there will only need to be room in each stockpile for 1,000 to 2,000 tons. The pug mill and stockpile area will be located near the sites as shown on **Figure 5-2.** This will provide for easy access for the excavation equipment to bring the untreated soil to the pug mill, and for the trucks that will haul the treated material to the landfill.

This alternative requires approximately 1 acre of land at each site, or a combined total of approximately 2 acres if soils from both sites are combined into one landfill. A landfill can be constructed for both sites at a location convenient to the pug mill and the sites. The exact location will be determined during predesign activities. However, the landfill (or landfills) must be located so that the base is at least 5 feet above the seasonal high water table and 10 feet above bedrock.

#### 5.5.2 **Protection of Human Health and the Environment**

An evaluation of the protectiveness of human health and the environment includes the assessment of the short- and long-term effectiveness as well as permanence. The following discussion will show how this alternative meets these criteria.

#### $5.5.2.1$ **Short-term Protectiveness**

Several items are included in an assessment of the short-term protectiveness of Alternative 5. The first issue is protection of the community during the remedial action. This alternative is protective of the community. All treatment and disposal will be accomplished on site, so that there will be no transport of hazardous materials. There is also little threat from dust released during the excavation. The site is located far from the SEDA boundary, so the likelihood of any hazardous dust migrating offsite is negligible. As discussed in Sections 6 and 7 of the RI report, fugitive dust migration is not a major migration pathway.

The short-term protectiveness to site workers must also be considered. The major routes of exposure during treatment are direct contact with the contaminated soil and inhalation of vapors or particulates. Protection from exposure can be minimized through site access controls and the use of proper protective equipment for site workers, such as dust masks and Tyvek protective clothing. Air monitoring may be used to determine if there is a significant threat from the inhalation of vapors or particulate. Dust generation at the excavation can be minimized by using water or other dust control chemicals. Dust generation can be minimized at the pug mill by containing all admixtures which tend to from dust (i.e., cement and lime), and by containing the mixing process. The solidification/stabilization process is very similar to normal cement construction procedures, and is therefore fairly straightforward. It should also be noted that all the site workers will be required to meet all the OSHA training and medical monitoring requirements prior to working on site.

Another part of the short-term protectiveness criterion is assessing the environmental impacts during the remedial action. For Alternative 5, there will be little or no environmental impacts. This alternative calls for construction type activities in an active portion of the Depot. These activities will not be substantially different from what is currently occurring. In addition, since the hazardous material is primarily in the soil, there is little or no risk of a spill or release during the remedial action.

The last item to be considered is the time until treatment is accomplished. Initially, there will be a substantial period of time required to obtain the necessary permits and approvals for construction of the landfill. The actual remedial action (excavation and stabilization) should be completed in a brief period of time. The initial treatability testing and vendor selection should take two to three months. Once the treatability testing is completed and a vendor is selected, the mobilization time should be less than one month, since no specialized equipment is required. All of the equipment used is standard construction equipment. Little permitting will be required, and operations should begin quickly. The remedial action would take one to three months, depending primarily on the time needed for the solidified soil to cure.

There will also be time required to properly close the landfill, probably two to three months. By this time, the waste will have been treated and will no longer be hazardous, so the threats to human health and the environment will be negligible.

#### **Long-term Protectiveness** 5.5.2.2

The assessment of the long-term protectiveness of Alternative 5 can be divided into two major categories, an assessment of the magnitude of the residual risk, and an evaluation of the adequacy and reliability of the controls used for the waste residuals and untreated soil.

The magnitude of the residual risk is easy to quantify. The removal plan for the soils/sediments will be designed such that the remaining soils demonstrate a lead concentration less than 500 mg/kg and sediments demonstrated a lead concentration of less than 31 mg/kg. There will be no treatment residuals left at the site, so the treatment residuals will not be included in the risk evaluation.

The controls to be used for long-term management are more involved. The material disposed in the landfill will not be hazardous, and there will be no long term threat to human health and the environment. However, there will be a landfill on site which will require maintenance.

The permanence of the alternative must also be assessed. Once the soil is encased in the Subtitle D landfill, the remedial action would be considered permanent. There will no longer be soil on the site that poses an unacceptable threat to human health and the environment.

There is some question about the permanence of the solidification/stabilization treatment technology. In general, the solidified soil, as with all concrete, is subject to weathering from freeze-thaw and wet-dry cycles. If the material is safely placed in a secure landfill, the material will be protected from weathering, and there would be no degradation of the concrete, which indicates that the treatment will be permanent.

Permanence is further enhanced by the use of stabilizing agents, such as lime. The lime reacts with the heavy metals to form insoluble carbonates and hydroxides. These products are far less soluble than the free metals, and are very resistant to weathering.

#### 5.5.2.3 Conclusion

Alternative 5 would protect human health and the environment. This alternative protects against ingestion of and direct contact with surface soils having concentrations of lead above 500 mg/kg and prevents potential leaching of lead into the groundwater by removing subsurface soils with concentrations of lead above 500 mg/kg and sediments with lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg.

SENECA SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17

The results of the baseline risk assessment show that conditions at SEAD-16 require a remedial action (see Section 2.0). Removal of Case 2 and Case 4 soils at SEAD-16 will reduce risk from soils to acceptable levels. Removal of Case 1 material from the buildings at SEAD-16 must also be conducted. At SEAD-17, though the risk assessment shows that conditions at the site do not require remedial action, removal of Case 1 and Case 3 soils will reduce the HI and carcinogenic risk to lower levels. Therefore, this alternative meets the RAOs by reducing risk.

This alternative also meets the NYSDEC sediment criteria established for lead in site sediments not to exceed 31 mg/kg. The sediments with concentrations of lead above the sediment criteria will be removed, which will meet the RAO for sediment and prevent contamination downgradient in Kendaia Creek.

#### 5.5.3 **Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume**

Overall, Alternative 5 would be effective in reducing the toxicity and mobility of the hazardous constituents present in the soil at the site. The treated soil will have a larger volume but will no longer be considered a hazardous waste or capable of leaching metals. In general, a volume increase of 50% for the treated soil can be expected. In addition, excavation of the remaining soils would increase the volume by approximately 20%.

The decrease in toxicity and mobility can be assessed on both a small scale and site-wide basis. On the small scale, both the toxicity and mobility of the hazardous constituents in the soil are assessed with the TCLP test. The larger the leaching fraction, the greater the mobility and the greater the toxicity. Since the primary treatment criteria for solidification/stabilization is that the waste no longer be TC hazardous, the treated waste will exhibit lower toxicity and mobility than the untreated waste. The mass of the potentially hazardous constituents in the soil will remain unchanged.

There are also major decreases on a site-wide basis. By treating the soil at the site which contains the highest concentrations of hazardous constituents, the overall site risk (toxicity) will be reduced. By transferring the treated soil and remaining excavated soils and sediments to a properly constructed Subtitle D landfill, the mobility of the hazardous constituents will be effectively reduced.

#### 5.5.4 Implementability

A discussion of implementability can be divided into three sections, technical feasibility, administrative feasibility, and availability of services and materials. Technical feasibility describes items such as construction and operation, technology reliability, and monitoring considerations. Administrative

feasibility addresses issues such as permitting, interaction with NYSDEC and EPA, and community relations. Availability of services and materials describes the ease of obtaining vendors and equipment, and the availability of offsite disposal capacity.

#### 5.5.4.1 **Technical Feasibility**

The overall technical feasibility of Alternative 5 is good, but the issues involved with the construction of an onsite landfill are somewhat complicated, as described below. Solidification/stabilization is a technology which has been frequently used to treat similar soils, and it is not anticipated that problems will be encountered during construction, as long as the proper treatability work has been completed to establish the optimal admixture ratios. Since the materials and equipment used are all standard construction equipment, the process can be operated in almost all weather conditions.

The excavation process is also well defined. The areas demonstrating elevated concentrations of heavy metals have been delineated, and it will be straightforward to develop an excavation plan that assures all of the hot spots are removed. It is possible that some minor weather delays may be encountered, but most of the soil to be removed is located above grade, and should not be adversely affected by wet conditions.

There are a number of technical issues which must be addressed in order to properly construct an onsite landfill. Landfill construction is a common practice, and the issues are not especially complicated, but the overall technical complexity of Alternative 5 is much greater than Alternative 4.

The first issue is landfill siting. In order to meet the NYSDEC requirement that the landfill be at least five feet above the seasonal high water table, the landfill will need to be located on high ground, and most likely, on several feet of clean fill. The landfill will have to be designed to allow access during construction and filling. Also, since the landfill will be completely above grade, more stringent erosion control measures will be required. The weather is an important factor. Heavy rains or other adverse weather conditions could severely impact the construction schedule.

Another aspect of technical feasibility is the ease with which additional work may be conducted. At this time, it is anticipated that this remedial action will preclude the necessity of any additional remedial efforts at SEAD-16 and 17. However, if additional work is required in the future, this remedial action will not interfere in any way.

Several monitoring requirements govern the solidification/stabilization process. The monitoring requirements of the solidification/stabilization process are essentially the same as for Alternative 4. The

additives must be properly metered into the soil to assure proper treatment. The soil which has been treated must be tested to ensure that the contaminants have been stabilized. Air monitoring will likely be necessary to determine if movement of the soil is releasing contaminants to the air.

There are a number of monitoring requirements for the landfill. The landfill construction requires continual supervision and testing, since there are a number of requirements for each layer. A Construction Quality Assurance (CQA) plan will be developed which describes the specific requirements for the landfill. Some of the major items to be addressed are described below.

The initial fill layer must be compacted to ensure that it will have sufficient structural strength to support the landfill. Next, the low permeability soil layer is installed in lifts, with each lift monitored for compaction and permeability. The geomembrane must be tested for holes and permeability, and the installed seams must be carefully inspected. Next, the geosynthetic drainage layer is installed, and finally the protective soil layer. There are similar monitoring requirements for the cap installation. Each layer must be carefully surveyed to ensure that the proper slopes are obtained. Problems at any point in the process may necessitate removal and reinstallation of a given laver.

#### 5.5.4.2 **Administrative Feasibility**

The administrative feasibility of this alternative is described in the New York code of regulations. The unit to be constructed is a Subtitle D landfill, and a NYSDEC permit would be required. The permit application requirements, described in 6 NYCRR Part 360 are broad, and include issues such as siting, design, closure, post closure, and monitoring. It would be necessary to obtain NYSDEC concurrence on the acceptability of a single composite liner system. Obtaining the necessary permit and concurrence could take six months to a year, or more, and would require a great deal of engineering and money.

The administrative feasibility of the solidification unit would be good, as with Alternative 4. Since there will only be a temporary treatment facility on site, no hazardous waste permitting will be required. Construction permits necessary for the activities are readily attainable. In addition, there will be no transport of waste offsite.

Coordination with the various regulatory agencies is also important. As described above, the Army has coordinated the entire remedial program with both EPA and NYSDEC, and will consider input from both these agencies in the final remedy selection. It is anticipated that any issues arising with the regulatory agencies will be addressed prior to remedy selection.

#### 5.5.4.3 **Availability of Services and Materials**

This technologies used for this alternative rely primarily on standard equipment, which is readily available in the Romulus area. The excavation would be accomplished with backhoes and scrapers, and the material would be transported in standard size dumptrucks. The stabilization unit would consist of a temporary pug mill, or if the volume is fairly small, the stabilization could be conducted in a cement truck.

Startup time to implement solidification/stabilization is one to two months, depending on the level of effort necessary for treatability testing. Bench-scale tests will likely be necessary to determine the proper additives and ratios of additives to contaminated soil. These must be brought to the site along with the earth moving and mixing equipment. Total treatment time for sites such as SEAD-16 and 17 is approximately 2 to 4 months, including the treatability studies.

Obtaining the construction materials for the landfill would require a clay source to be identified, tested for quality and quantity and brought to the site. It is anticipated that a local source would be available, since the base soils in the Finger Lakes region are clays. Clean fill could be obtained on the Depot. The geomembrane and geosynthetic drainage layer are available from a number of vendors.

#### 5.5.5 Cost

#### 5.5.5.1 **Capital Costs**

There are two separate capital costs to consider, the cost of the soil treatment, and the cost of the landfill construction. The costs for solidification/stabilization vary depending on quantities and types of additives and the field mixing techniques used. Design treatability study costs are \$86,118 total treatment costs, including site preparation and excavation are approximately \$100 per ton. Additional items, including engineering, oversight, and site restoration would bring the total cost for remediation of 2,180 cubic yards to \$802,523. Again, there is some uncertainty in this cost. A breakdown of the costs for this alternative and all assumptions used are presented in Appendix C.

#### 5.5.5.2 O & M Costs

There are a number of  $O$  & M costs associated with the onsite landfill. The first of these is quarterly groundwater monitoring, which will depend on the number of parameters and wells required by NYSDEC. There are also general maintenance costs for the vegetative cover, erosion control, equipment upkeep, and annual sediment sampling in Kendaia Creek. The total O & M costs are estimated to be \$81,688 per year (Appendix C).

#### 5.5.5.3 **Present Worth Costs**

The present worth costs for Alternative 5 are estimated to be \$1.1 million.

#### 5.6 **ANALYSIS** OF **ALTERNATIVE** 6: **EXCAVATION, SOIL** WASHING. **BACKFILLING COARSE FRACTION, OFFSITE LANDFILL FINE FRACTION**

#### 5.6.1 **Definition of Alternative 6**

#### $5.6.1.1$ **Description**

This alternative includes excavation of soils and sediments and materials in the abandoned building at SEAD-16, soil washing, offsite landfilling of the fine fraction, and backfilling of the coarse fraction. Each of these processes will be described briefly in this section. A detailed analysis of how this option meets the selection criteria, and a budgetary cost estimate are provided below.

The first step in this alternative, as with the other alternatives, is excavation. The volumes to be excavated are the same as for the other options, a combined total for both sites of 2,180 CY. The soil and sediment volumes include surface and subsurface soils with lead concentrations that exceed 500 mg/kg, and sediments that exceed the NYSDEC sediment criteria for lead of 31 mg/kg. Locations are shown on Figures 2-1 and 2-2.

The next step is the soil washing process. The primary purpose of soil washing is to separate soil into component parts, and in the process, do some scrubbing and washing of the components. Soil washing experiments have shown that a significant portion of the hazardous constituents present in the soil are concentrated generally in the fine fraction and that the coarse fraction can be cleaned by physically separating and concentrating the fines. The soil washing process separates the fractions, and the fine fraction is then subjected to additional treatment. The coarse fraction, which no longer contains excessive levels of the hazardous constituents, is no longer a waste and can be backfilled on site. It is estimated that the fine fraction will make up 30 percent of the overall volume. The actual quantity of the fine fraction would need to be determined with a treatability study.

The following is a general description of a soil washing process which would be applicable to this site. First, the waste material is fed into a hopper which screens the oversize material (more than 1/4 inch diameter) from the finer fractions. The oversize material then goes to a rotary drum where it is tumbled washed, tested, and backfilled to the site.

The remaining soil is passed into a device with hydroclones which turns the material into a slurry and pumps it through the hydroclones. The hydroclones mechanically separate the slurry into two streams, the coarse material (sand and gravel) and the fine material (silt and clay) and water.

The coarse material may then be directed to froth flotation cells which wash it with surfactants. The flotation cells, which aerate the material, and the surfactant washing generate a heavy froth. The organic and inorganic contaminants in the soil will move with the froth. The froth is then skimmed from the top of the material and is considered a hazardous waste. The soil passing through the froth flotation units, i.e., the coarse fraction, has been shown to pass the TCLP and can then be backfilled to the site.

The fine material and water are sent to a sludge basin where the solids are settled out. The sludge is dewatered and then further treated or disposed. The water will be treated prior to discharge.

The process separates the soil into four streams: (1) oversize material, which is generally non-hazardous and can be backfilled to the site, (2) clean sand and gravel, which also can be backfilled, (3) sludge consisting of the fine fraction, which is a hazardous waste, and (4) concentrated froth from the flotation unit (if utilized) which is also considered a hazardous waste. For this alternative, the fine fraction and froth will be transported offsite to a TSDF. The TSDF will then be responsible for the solidification/stabilization, or whatever treatment is necessary for the soil prior to disposal in their landfill. Since the only criteria for landfilling is that RCRA land ban requirements be met, the TSDF may opt for an abbreviated treatment process.

The final step in the remedial action is site restoration. After the coarse fraction has been backfilled to the site, the sites will be regraded with a bulldozer in a manner which approximates the original grade. If necessary, clean fill will be brought in to make up for the soils excavated. The topsoil cover will be vegetated with indigenous grasses as an erosion control measure. Once the cover is established, there will be no continued maintenance requirements.

#### **Process Flow and Site Layout** 5.6.1.2

An example process flow schematic for soil washing is shown in Figure 5-3 For the small volume of material at SEAD-16 and 17, physical separation only with no acid extraction is likely to be most cost effective. However, acid extraction is considered here for completeness. The equipment layout location



is shown in Figure 5-2. A soil washing operation will consist of several or all of the following processes:

Vibratory screen - This unit separates the feed, and removes oversized (greater than 2-inch diameter) particles.

Feeder module and conveyor - This unit carries and weighs material fed to the soil washer.

Trommel screen - This unit breaks up clumped feed materials.

Attrition scrubber - This unit adds the washwater to the broken up soil. The washwater mobilizes the fine fraction of the soil.

·Hydrocyclone separators - This unit is a solids/liquid flash separation device which separates the coarse (sand and gravel) soil from the fine (silt and clay) soil.

Dense media separation column - This unit separates materials based on density, and would be used to separate pieces of munitions, elemental metals and other debris from the soil to be treated.

Dewatering screen - This unit removes the fine material from the process train. The coarse fraction is rinsed, and removed from the soil washer.

Washwater treatment system - The spent washwater is treated for reuse or disposal. The type of treatment used is site-specific.

·Belt filter press - This unit dewaters the fine fraction prior to solidification.

The stockpiled soil will be loaded into the soil washing unit with front-end loader. The conveyor will likely be equipped with a scale to keep track of the quantity of soil treated. For this site, a 25-tph unit will be used. This unit is delivered on fifteen 45-foot trailers. The total size of the soil washing operation is approximately 100 feet by 200 feet. The assembled unit has a height of 50 feet. The unit requires a 600-kW, 440-Volt AC power supply, and a 25 gallons per minute (gpm) water source.

The coarse fraction is removed from the unit, allowed to dry, and stockpiled in a clean soil area. The material can be tested to ensure that the hazardous constituents have been removed to acceptable levels. The material will then be re-used as clean fill.

November 1997

After dewatering, the fine material will be solidified and disposed of in an offsite Subtitle D landfill. The solidification will be accomplished at an offsite TSDF as described for Alternatives 4 and 5. The water will be treated on-site or sent to the Depot Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) for treatment. The cost estimate assumes that the water can be treated at the Depot POTW at minimal cost.

#### Protection of Human Health and the Environment  $5.6.2$

An evaluation of the protection of human health and the environment includes the assessment of the short- and long-term effectiveness as well as permanence. The following discussion will show how this alternative meets these criteria.

#### **Short-term Protectiveness**  $5.6.2.1$

This alternative will be evaluated with respect to the effect on human health and the environment during the implementation of the remediation action. Four items are included in an assessment of the short-term protectiveness of Alternative 6. The first issue is protection of the community during the remedial action. This alternative is protective of the community. Because the final treatment will be not be accomplished on site, there will be transport of hazardous materials. Care will be taken to assure that the trucks are not overloaded. The soils will be covered with a tarp during transport to ensure that no dust is released from the trucks.

There is also little threat from dust released during the excavation. The sites are located far from the SEDA boundary, so the likelihood of any hazardous dust migrating offsite is negligible. As discussed in Sections 6 and 7 of the RI report, fugitive dust migration is not a major migration pathway.

The short-term protectiveness to site workers must also be considered. The major routes of exposure during excavation are direct contact with the affected soil and inhalation of vapors or particulates. There is also potential for exposure to soils and other hazardous materials during the soil washing process. Protection from exposure can be minimized through site access controls and the use of proper protective equipment for site workers, such as dust masks and Tyvek protective clothing. Air monitoring may be used to determine if there is a significant threat from the inhalation of vapors or particulates. Dust generation at the excavation can be minimized by using water or other dust control chemicals. It should also be noted that all the site workers will be required to meet all the OSHA training and medical monitoring requirements prior to working on site. All of the contractor personnel working around the soil washing unit will be trained in the proper health and safety procedures to be used near the unit.

Another part of the short-term effectiveness criteria is assessing the environmental impacts during the remedial action. For Alternative 6, there will be few environmental impacts. There is the potential for spills during excavation, but the soil is a solid, and spills would readily be contained. There is also a potential for releases of washwater from the soil washing unit. This threat is minimized with proper controls and inspections of the units. The site workers will be trained in the proper operation of the unit operations.

The last item to be considered is the time until treatment is accomplished. Alternative 6 should take three to six months to complete. Mobilization would take two weeks. It would take an additional three weeks to fine tune the unit. Once the unit is fully operational at 25 tph, it would take one to three months to complete the soil washing step. Backfill, transport of the fines offsite, and demobilization would be expected to take another two to four weeks. Once the fines are removed and the coarse fraction is backfilled, the remedial action would be complete.

#### 5.6.2.2 **Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence**

The assessment of the long-term effectiveness of Alternative 6 can be divided into two major categories, an assessment of the magnitude of the residual risk, and an evaluation of the adequacy and reliability of the controls used for the waste residuals and untreated soil.

The magnitude of the residual risk is easy to quantify. The removal plan for the soils and sediments will be designed such that the remaining soils demonstrate a concentration of lead below 500 mg/kg and sediments demonstrate a lead concentration below 31 mg/kg. The only treatment residuals remaining on site will be the coarse fraction of the soil, which will have been tested to ensure that there are no unacceptable levels of lead remaining. Initially, some maintenance will be required to reestablish a vegetative cover at the site. Once the cover is established, there will be no need for long-term maintenance.

The permanence of the alternative must also be assessed. Once the soil fines are removed from the site, the remedial action would be considered permanent. There will no longer be soil on the site that poses an unacceptable threat to human health and the environment.

#### 5.6.2.3 Conclusion

This alternative would protect human health and the environment. This alternative protects against ingestion of and direct contact with surface soils having concentrations of lead above 500 mg/kg and sediments with lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg.

### SENECA SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17

The results of the baseline risk assessment show that conditions at SEAD-16 require a remedial action (see Section 2.0). Removal of Case 2 and Case 4 soils at SEAD-16 will reduce risk from soils to acceptable levels. At SEAD-17, though the risk assessment shows that conditions at the site do not require remedial action, removal of Case 1 and Case 3 soils will reduce the HI and carcinogenic risk to lower levels. Therefore, this alternative meets the RAOs by reducing risk.

This alternative also meets the NYSDEC sediment criteria established for lead in site sediments (Case 3 at SEAD-16 and Case 2 at SEAD-17) not to exceed 31 mg/kg. The sediments with concentrations of lead above the sediment criteria will be removed, which will meet the RAO for sediment and prevent contamination downgradient in Kendaia Creek.

#### 5.6.3 **Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume**

Alternative 6 would be effective in reducing the toxicity, mobility, and volume of the hazardous constituents present at the site. The primary goal of soil washing is volume reduction, and the process is expected to reduce the volume of contaminated soil to approximately 30 percent of the original volume. The toxicity and mobility reductions are accomplished in the solidification process. The potentially hazardous constituents are stabilized in the process, which reduces the toxicity. The solidification and subsequent landfilling of the soil fines reduces the mobility. The final mobility of the hazardous constituents is negligible.

#### 5.6.4 Implementability

A discussion of implementability can be divided into three sections, technical feasibility, administrative feasibility, and availability of services and materials. Technical feasibility describes items such as construction and operation, technology reliability, and monitoring considerations. Administrative feasibility addresses issues such as permitting, interaction with NYSDEC and EPA, and community relations. Availability of services and materials describes the ease of obtaining vendors and equipment, and the availability of offsite disposal capacity.

#### 5.6.4.1 **Technical Feasibility**

The technical feasibility of Alternative 6 is fairly good. Soil washing has been used for a number of years, and has been demonstrated to be effective at sites with similar contamination, but treatability studies will be necessary to confirm that the technology will be effective at SEAD-16 and 17. The solidification/stabilization process is known to be effective for treating the soil washing residuals. The technical advantages of soil washing is to decrease the quantity of material that will require

solidification. The solidification process will also be more effective because the cement matrix will solidify easier with a matrix of fines.

The excavation portion of the remediation can also be readily implemented. The areas demonstrating elevated concentrations of heavy metals have been delineated, and the excavation plan will ensure that all of the hot spots are removed. It is possible that some minor weather delays may be encountered, but most of the soil to be removed is located above grade, and should not be adversely affected by wet conditions.

Another aspect of technical feasibility is the ease with which additional work may be conducted. At this time, it is anticipated that this remedial action will preclude the necessity of any additional remedial efforts at SEAD-16 and 17. However, if additional work is required in the future, this remedial action will not interfere in any way. Once the remedial action is complete, the site will be revegetated, and will essentially remain as it is now.

#### 5.6.4.2 **Administrative Feasibility**

The administrative feasibility of this alternative is as good or better than the rest of the alternatives. This option greatly reduces the volume of material to be landfill. Construction permits necessary for the activities are readily attainable. Due to the volume reduction, there will be minimal transport of hazardous waste, and the number of manifests will be reduced. All the contractors used for excavation and hauling will be experienced in preparing manifests.

Coordination with the various regulatory agencies is also important. The Army has coordinated the entire remedial program with both EPA and NYSDEC, and will consider input from both these agencies in the final remedy selection. It is anticipated that any issues arising with the regulatory agencies will be addressed prior to remedy selection.

#### 5.6.4.3 **Availability of Services and Materials**

There is good availability of the materials and services necessary to accomplish this alternative. Several companies have extensive experience in implementing soil washing, including Bergmann U.S.A., and Biotrol, Inc. These companies can rapidly assemble the necessary unit operations for SEAD-16 and 17.

The excavation and hauling equipment and Subtitle D landfill space is readily available. The equipment to be used is fairly standard, and is available from a number of vendors.

#### 5.6.5 Cost

#### 5.6.5.1 **Capital Costs**

There are four major cost items for this alternative, excavation and backfilling, soil washing, solidification, and offsite disposal. Transportation is also a cost to consider. Soil washing costs are estimated to be \$127 per cubic yard (\$58 per ton). Solidification costs and offsite disposal costs (including transportation) would be \$48 per cubic yard (\$22 per ton). The total cost including engineering, oversight, and site restoration for remediation of 2,180 cubic yards is \$831,345 million. The costs and assumptions made for this alternative is provided in Appendix C.

#### O & M Costs 5.6.5.2

There will be two O & M costs associated with Alternative 6. The first of these is quarterly groundwater monitoring, which would depend on the number of parameters and wells required by NYSDEC. The second O & M cost is yearly sampling of sediments in Kendaia Creek. The annual cost for O & M is estimated to be \$41,688.

Once the remedial action is completed, there will be no residuals remaining on site which require management. Initially, there will be some minor costs associated with the establishment of the vegetative cover, but the cost estimate for these items have been included in the capital costs.

#### 5.6.5.3 **Present Worth Costs**

The present worth costs for Alternative 6 are estimated to be \$991,531 million.

#### **COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES** 5.7

#### 5.7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to compare each of the four alternatives detailed above to each other with respect to the specific evaluation criteria. The following discussion will rate each of the alternatives with regard to the evaluation criteria, and identify the relative advantages and disadvantages of each. The tradeoffs among the different alternatives will be discussed. This comparison will provide the information necessary to decide the appropriate alternative for this site.

### SENECA SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17

The discussion is divided into two groups. The first group, the threshold criteria, include the overall protection of human health and the environment. The next group includes the remainder of the evaluation criteria: long term effectiveness and permanence, reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume through treatment, short-term effectiveness, implementability, and cost.

#### 5.7.2 **Threshold Criteria**

Each alternative must be assessed against the threshold criteria, which are overall protection of human health and the environment and compliance with ARARs, because both criteria must be met by any alternative in order to be eligible for selection.

All of the alternatives for soil/sediment, except Alternative 1 (No-Action), provide protection of human health and the environment. Soils with lead concentrations above 500 mg/kg and sediments with lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg will be removed for the three alternatives considered. Removal of these materials will prevent dermal contact and ingestion, which have been identified during the BRA as the major exposure pathways for soil at SEAD-16 and 17 in Sections 6 and 7 of the RI. Additionally, the BRA determined that the HI at SEAD-16 for future construction worker exposure scenario was above the EPA acceptable risk level. Alternatives 4, 5, or 6 will each reduce risk to acceptable levels at SEAD-16 (refer to discussion in Section 2.0). Though at SEAD-17 the BRA determined that the risks were below acceptable EPA target levels, removal of soil at SEAD-17 would reduce risk further, increasing the degree of human health protection.

Removal of sediments in the drainage ditches will protect environmental receptors by preventing migration of sediments with lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg to Kendaia Creek, which is downgradient of SEAD-16 and 17. Additionally, removal of contaminated surface and subsurface soil will decrease any potential for migration to groundwater.

All alternatives remove sediments with lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg. This meets the NYSDEC sediment criteria. Since these criteria are promulgated regulations, they are considered to be ARARs for SEAD-16 and 17 (refer to Section 2.0). Therefore, only the No-Action alternative does not comply with ARARs.

#### **Other Considerations** 5.7.3

#### 5.7.3.1 **Long Term Effectiveness and Permanence**

The criteria of long-term effectiveness addresses the long-term protectiveness to human health and the environment. Most of the detailed alternatives are highly effective in eliminating the long-term threats because they rely on treatment technologies to reduce the hazardous constituents in the soils. Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 will excavate all soils with unacceptable levels of lead and sediments from drainage ditches with concentrations of lead above the established criteria; Alternatives 4 and 5 will use a Subtitle D landfill and Alternative 6 will backfill the coarse fraction to the site. This coarse fraction will no longer contain concentrations of lead above 500 mg/kg. Alternative 6 is the most effective in eliminating the long-term threats because the soil washing process segregates the coarse and fine fractions, and all the hazardous constituents are sent off site in the fines fraction. This is a reliable technology which has been successfully utilized at similar sites. All three of the alternatives rely on some type of stabilization technology. This is considered to be technically feasible, and when combined with landfilling, provides effective long term protection.

However, Alternatives 4 and 5 do not score as well as Alternative 6 because the long-term health risks associated with the Subtitle D landfills, which will be used for Alternatives 4 and 5, are not completely understood. Alternative 5, the on-site disposal alternative, is ranked next highest because this alternative involves treatment and construction of a new on-site landfill. Since this landfill would be on-site, it would be easy to monitor and maintain to assure long term effectiveness. The long term liabilities associated with offsite disposal, as for Alternative 4, would be eliminated. Alternative 1, the no action alternative, does not provide long-term protection of human health and the environment.

The rankings of the alternatives based on permanence are essentially the same as the rankings for longterm protectiveness. Since Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 provide treatment, they are essentially permanent. Alternatives 4 and 5 use landfills, which will require some long-term maintenance of the cap and groundwater monitoring. Alternative 1, the no action alternative is not permanent since no treatment is taking place.

#### 5.7.3.2 **Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume**

The alternatives are also compared with respect to the relative decreases in the toxicity, mobility, and volume of the hazardous constituents present at the site. Alternative 6, which uses the soil washing process, yields the greatest reduction in the toxicity by separating the fines and solidifying this smaller volume of material. The hazardous constituents are normally concentrated in the fines fraction of the

## SENECA SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17

soil which will be solidified. The solidification process is more effective for fines than large aggregate materials. Alternatives 4 and 5 also significantly decrease the toxicity, but only for the soils which are treated by stabilization/solidification. The solidification/stabilization process decreases the toxicity of the metals because the metals are converted to less soluble forms. Neither Alternative 4 or 5 completely treat all of the soils at the site. For both alternatives, 875 CY of untreated soils and sediments will be placed in a solid waste landfill. Alternative 1, the no action alternative, does not reduce the toxicity of the hazardous constituents.

Alternative 6 provides the best reductions in mobility. Once the fines fraction is solidified and landfilled, the hazardous constituents are essentially immobile. Alternatives 4 and 5 are similar in nature and were ranked the same. For Alternatives 4 and 5, approximately 875 CY of untreated soil are placed in a landfill, which will reduce the mobility of the hazardous constituents in the soils. Alternative 1, the no action alternative does nothing to reduce the mobility of the hazardous constituents.

Alternative 6 provides the greatest volume reduction of the contaminated soils. The hazardous constituents are concentrated in the fines fraction, which reduces the volume of the contaminated soil to approximately 30 percent of the original volume. Alternatives 4 and 5, which rely on solidification, do not score as well on volume reduction. Because soils are treated, the volume of hazardous soil, is reduced, however the treatment residual (soil/cement mixture) has a greater volume than the initial untreated soil. Furthermore, the remaining soils which will be excavated and landfilled will increase in volume by approximately 20% as a result of the excavation process. In Alternative 1, the no action alternative, there is no volume decrease, but there is also no volume increase.

#### 5.7.3.3 **Short-term Effectiveness**

Alternative 5 is expected to have the best short-term effectiveness because no hazardous materials are removed from the site, and only trained site workers would handle the soils. The soil washing alternative (Alternative 6) does not rate as well because of the necessity of greater handling of the contaminated soil, and because of the greater quantities of treatment residuals, such as spent wash water which must then be treated. Alternative 4, in which the soils are not treated prior to being transported to the TSD facility also scores lower, because there is transport of approximately 2,180 CY, of RCRA characteristic hazardous waste. Alternative 1, the no action alternative provides good short-term protection of human health because of the administrative controls currently in place, but provides no short-term protection of the environment.

November 1997

#### 5.7.3.4 Implementability

All of the alternatives score well on implementability. For technical feasibility, Alternative 1, the no action alternative, and Alternative 4, which relies on off site treatment and disposal, score the highest. Alternative 4 requires primarily standard earth moving equipment. Alternatives 4 and 5 are both easy to implement, since they require only standard construction equipment, though a large cement plant is required for these alternatives. Alternative 4 rates higher than Alternative 5 because it is easier to send the soils off site for disposal than to construct an on-site Subtitle D landfill. Alternative 6 is the most difficult to implement because of the need for specialized soil washing equipment, but there are enough soil washing vendors to ensure that this option is still viable.

The availability of the equipment, materials, and vendors is very good for all the alternatives. Alternative 4 rates the best on availability, because these materials are more available from local suppliers than the other alternatives. Alternative 6 scores the worst because there are less soil washing vendors than there are solidification vendors, but this will not preclude implementation of this alternative.

The last item to consider is agency approval. Alternative 6 is the best because of the greatest volume reduction. Alternatives 4 and 5 rate lower because of the work required to site and permit an on site landfill. Alternative 1, the no action alternative is the worst.

#### $5.7.4$ Cost

The last criteria to compare is cost. This comparison will evaluate the present worth costs of the alternatives, which are presented on Table 5-2. Alternative 4 is the least expensive with an estimated cost of \$570,784 to \$773,110. Alternative 5, which includes on-site solidification and disposal in a Subtitle D landfill, has a present cost of \$991,531 million and Alternative 6 was the most costly, at an estimated cost of \$1.1 million. A breakdown of these costs are provided in Appendix C.

#### 5.8 **CONCLUSIONS**

As described above, all of the alternatives in the detailed analysis will be effective for SEAD-16 and 17 remedial action for the intended future use of the site as industrial/commercial. The baseline human health assessment indicates that, under future industrial and commercial worker exposure scenarios, the risk based non-carginiogenic hazard index is above acceptable levels, although carcinogenic risks are within acceptable levels. Therefore, remedial action is required at SEAD-16 to meet remedial objectives for protecting human health. At SEAD-17, risk based carcinogenic and non-carginogenic health risks are

# Table 5-2 Seneca Army Depot Activity<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY **Cost Estimate Summary for Retained Alternatives**



within acceptable levels. Therefore, risk based remedial objectives have been met at SEAD-17 with no further action.

However, the risk analyses could not consider the presence of lead in soils. The allowable level of lead in soil to protect human health has been determined to be 500 mg/kg. The allowable level in sediment is 31 mg/kg based on NYSDEC sediment criteria. Therefore, site specific remedial action for lead are based on removing soils with lead concentrations above 500 mg/kg and sediment with lead concentrations above  $31 \text{ mg/kg}$ . In addition, at SEAD-16, the material inside abandoned buildings S-311 and 366 contribute significantly to the non-carcinogenic risk levels. Therefore this materials must also be removed and the buildings must be cleaned.

Alternatives 4,5, and 6 were determined to meet the site specific remedial action objectives. That is, they are protective against ingestion of and dermal contact with soils having lead concentrations above 500 mg/kg, sediments having lead concentrations above 31 mg/kg, and dust caused by excess debris and materials that are now inside the abandoned buildings at SEAD-16.

Alternative 6 ranks the highest for long-term protectiveness of human health and the environment, permanence, and reductions in toxicity, mobility, and volume of hazardous constituents. Alternative 4, which involves offsite treatment and disposal, ranks highest for implementability and cost. Furthermore, Alternative 4 is far less costly than Alternative 6. However, Alternative 4 ranks lowest for short-term protectiveness because all the soils, some of which are characteristic RCRA hazardous waste (according to expected TCLP results), are transported offsite for disposal, while Alternative 5 ranks highest for short-term protectiveness because no hazardous materials are transported from the site.

## **APPENDIX A**

## **ANALYTICAL DATA**

 $\tilde{\psi}$ 

November 1997




 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{TL}\_\text{A-1a} \\ \text{SEMCA ARMY DEPOT} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

 $\overline{()}$ 

SEAD-16 Building Materials Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 1



SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SENECA ARMY DEPOT Table A-1a

×

h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 2

11/1/97

 $\begin{tabular}{|c|c|} \hline 130 & UJ \\ 130 & UJ \\ 610 & J \\ \hline \end{tabular}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 130 \text{ UJ} \\ 130 \text{ UJ} \\ 3100 \text{ J} \end{array}$ 

 $130 U$ <br> $130 U$ <br> $610$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 130 \\ 130 \\ 130 \end{array}$ 

 $130 U$ <br> $130 U$ <br> $130 U$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 130 \text{ U} \\ 130 \text{ U} \\ 130 \text{ U} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 130 \text{ } \text{UJ} \\ 130 \text{ } \text{UJ} \\ 72 \text{ } \text{J} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 130 \text{ U} \\ 170 \text{ J} \\ 130 \text{ U} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 220 \text{ J} \\ 120 \text{ U} \\ 4600 \text{ J} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} 1200 \text{ U} \\ 1200 \text{ U} \\ 36000 \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} 620000 \text{ U} \\ 620000 \text{ U} \end{array}$ 19000000

 $\begin{array}{l} 120000 \text{ U} \\ 120000 \text{ U} \\ 3700000 \end{array}$ 

**UGKG**<br>UGKG UGKG

NITROAROMATICS

 $2,4,6$ -Trinitrotoluene<br>2,4-Dinitrotoluene 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{A-1a} \\ \text{SEMECA ARMY DEPOT} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

3

SEAD-16 Building Materials Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

11/1/97

Page 3







 $\bigcirc$ 

SEAD-16 Building Material Analytical Results (Asbestos)



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

 ${\bf Table~A-lb}$ SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Building Material Analytical Results (Asbestos)



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 4

L. \_\_A-1b<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Building Material Analytical Results (Asbestos)



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 5

Table A-1b<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Building Material Analytical Results (Asbestos)

ÿ,

í.



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page  $6$ 

11/197

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{7.} & \text{A-lb} \\ \text{SEAL-16 AND 17 FEASBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

 $\bigcirc$ 

SEAD-16 Building Material Analytical Results (Asbestos)



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 7

Table A-1b<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Building Material Analytical Results (Asbestos)



h:\eng\^^neca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 8

**L6/L/1** 







SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 10

 ${\small \begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table \textit{A-2} \\ \bf SERECA ARMY DEPOT \\ \bf SEAD-16 AND 17 FESIBILITY STUDY \end{tabular}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 11

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table \textit{A-2} \\ \bf SENECA \textit{ARMY DEPOT} \\ \bf SEAD-16 \textit{AND 17 FEASBILITY STUDY} \end{tabular}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 12

 ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-2}\\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FESSIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 13

11/1/97

5500 U

6700 U

5400 U

5400 U

UG/KG

Tane A-2<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 14

 ${\small\begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-2}\\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FERSIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 15

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{1}\,\text{acc}\,\text{A-2}\\ \text{SEAD-16}\,\text{AND}\,\text{17}\,\text{FEXIBILITY}\,\text{STUDY} \end{array}$ 

## SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



Page 16

h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

 ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-2} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEARSBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 17



SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 18

ć

 ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-2} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 19

Tabe A-2 SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 20

 ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-2}\\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FESSIBLIITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results

į,



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 21

 ${\bf Table}~{\sf A-2}$ SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results

 $\hat{\sigma}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 22

 ${\bf Table~A.2}$ SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 23

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Take A-2} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FERSIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results

j.

à,



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 24

 ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-2} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

MCPP

Page 25

 ${\bf \stackrel{Tawe\ A-2}{\bf \stackrel{SERCA\ ANN}{\bf \stackrel{DEPOT}}}}$  SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 26

 ${\bf Table\ A.2}$ SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 27

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Take } A\textbf{-2}\\ \textbf{SEAD-16 AND 17 FESSIBILITY STUDY} \end{tabular}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 28

 ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-2} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FESSIBLITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 29

11/197




Table A-3<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

 $\bar{\kappa}$ 

Page 30

Table A-3<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Subsurface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 31

**L6/1/1** 

 ${\bf Table\ A\mbox{-}3}$ SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Subsurface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

ś







 ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A4}\\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FESSIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

X

SEAD-16 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 33

## Table A-4<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

# SEAD-16 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 34

Table A-4<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

# SEAD-16 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 35

Table A-4<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

# SEAD-16 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 36

11/1/97

 $\begin{bmatrix} 47 & 1 \\ 29 & 1 \\ 360 \\ 620 \end{bmatrix}$ 

95 J **16 J** 

UG/KG

N-Nitrosodiphenylamine (1) Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene

Fluorene

Phenanthrene Naphthalene

Pyrene

790

320 J<br>1200

5000 NYSDEC TAGM UG/KG<br>50000 NYSDEC TAGM UG/KG

13000 NYSDEC TAGM UG/KG

 ${\bf Table~A4} \label{eq:2}$  SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-16 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

ś

Page 37

## ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-4}\\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$

# SEAD-16 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results

3500-S<br>16055<br>SA

3500-N<br>16084<br>SA

 $\begin{array}{lll} \text{LOC\_ID:} \\ \text{SAMP ID:} \\ \text{QC CODE:} \end{array}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 38



 ${\small \begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table\ A-5 \\ \bf SENECA A RMY DEPOT \\ \bf SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASBILITY STUDY \end{tabular}}$ 

SEAD-16 Sediment Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 39

 ${\small\begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-5} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASBLLITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Sediment Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 40

Table A-5<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

Ķ

## SEAD-16 Sediment Analytical Results

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

SW/SD16-6

SW/SD16-5

SW/SD16-4

SW/SD16-4

SW/SD16-10



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 41

## ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-5} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FESSBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$

## SEAD-16 Sediment Analytical Results





h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 42

## ${\small\begin{array}{c} \text{Table A-5} \\ \text{SENCEA ARMY DEPOT} \end{array}}$  SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

## SEAD-16 Sediment Analytical Results



Page 43

h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

 $120 U$ 

 $120U$ 

 $120U$ 

**UG/KG** 

NITROAROMATICS 2,4-Dinitrotoluene

#### SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY Table A-5<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT

## SEAD-16 Sediment Analytical Results

 $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ 

SW/SD16-9

SW/SD16-8

LOC\_ID:



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 44





 ${\small\begin{array}{l} \text{Table A-6} \\ \text{SENECA ARMY DEPOT} \end{array}}$  SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

 $\bigcirc$ 

## SEAD-16 Groundwater Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 1



 ${\small \begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table\ A6 \\ \bf SED-16 \ AND \begin{tabular}{ll} \bf 1214B & \bf 250B \\ \bf 131B & \bf 15B & \bf 25B \\ \bf 36B & \bf 17B & \bf 25B & \bf 35B \\ \bf 181B & \bf 17B & \bf 37C & \bf 37C \\ \bf 181B & \bf 17B & \bf 18B & \bf 18C \\ \bf 191B & \bf 19B & \bf 19B & \bf 18C \\ \bf 191B & \bf 19B & \bf 19B & \bf 19C \\ \bf$ 

h\eng\scription{1617fs\section2\16TABA\_XLS





 ${\small \begin{array}{ll} \text{Table A-7} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASBILITY STUDY} \end{array}}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Water Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 47

 ${\bf Table\ A-7} \\ {\bf SENECA\ A RMY DEPOT} \\ {\bf SEAD-16\ AND\ 17\ FESIBILITY \ STDDY}$ 

SEAD-16 Surface Water Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\16TABA.XLS

Page 48





 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Take A-8} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEARSBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results

J.

 $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 1

 ${\small \begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table\,\it A8\, \\ \bf SEND-16\,\it AND\,\it II\,\, FEARSBILITY\,\,SIDY \end{tabular}}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 2

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \bf{Table A-8} \\ \bf{SEAD-16} & \bf{ARMY DEPOT} \\ \bf{SEAD-16} & \bf{AND 17} \bf{FEASIBILITY} \\ \bf{STUDY} \end{tabular}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 3

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table~A+8 \\ \bf SEREDA ARMY DEPOT \\ \bf SEAD-16 AND 17 FERSIBILITY STUDY \end{tabular}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 4
$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Two A-8} \\ \text{SENEDA ARMY DEPOT} \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 5

11/1/97

 $120 U$ 

130 U

130 U

130 U

130 U

130 U

130 U

 $72J$ 

130 UR

**UG/KG** 

2,4-Dinitrotoluene

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Table A-8} \\ \textbf{SEAD-16 AND 17 FESSIBILITY STUDY} \end{tabular}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 6

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{3}\ \text{m.s.}\ \text{A-8}\\ \text{SEAD-16} \ \text{AND} \ 17 \ \text{FEASIBILITY} \ \text{STUDY} \end{array}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results

 $\tilde{\Sigma}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 7

 ${\small \begin{tabular}{l} \bf Table~A-8 \\ \bf SEREDA ARMY DEPOT \\ \bf SEAD-16 AND 17 FERSIBILITY STUDY \end{tabular}}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 8

11/1/97

 $120\,$  U

130 U

 $120U$ 

 $120\,$  U

 $120\,$  U

 $120\,$  U

 $120\,$  U

**UG/KG** 

2,4-Dinitrotoluene

Tane A-8<br>SENEDA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 9

Table A-8<br>SENEDA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results

į,

 $\tilde{\epsilon}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 10

11/197

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Take } A\text{-}8 \\ \text{SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 11

11/1/97

 $130 U$ 

130 U

120 U

 $120\,$  U

 $120$  U

 $120 U$ 

 $120 U$ 

 $120\,$  U

UG/KG

2,4-Dinitrotoluene

 ${\small \begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table~A-8 \\ \bf SEREDA ARMY DEPOT \\ \bf SEAD-16 AND 17 FERSIBILITY STUDY \end{tabular}}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 12

### ${\small \begin{array}{c} {\rm{Tane\ A\cdot 8}} \\ {\rm{SEAD\cdot 6\ ANN\ DEPOT}} \\ {\rm{SEAD\cdot 16\ AND\ 17\ FEASBLITY\ STUDY}} \end{array}}$

### SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 13

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Table A-8} \\ \textbf{SEAD-16 AND 17 FERSIBILITY STUDY} \end{tabular}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 14

11/197

 $130 U$ 

 $130 U$ 

130 U

170

UG/KG

SENEDA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY Taoic  $A-8$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

SEAD-17 Surface Soil Analytical Results



11/1/97

h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 15







 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Table A-9} \\ \text{SENECA ARMY DEPOT} \\ \text{FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

## SEAD-17 Subsurface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

172

57.1

80.2

93.4

82.5 NYSDEC TAGM MG/KG





Table A-10<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

# SEAD-17 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 17

### Table A-10<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY

# SEAD-17 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 18

11/197

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \bf Table A-10 \\ \bf SENECA A RMY DEPOT \\ \bf SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STDDY \end{tabular}$ 

# SEAD-17 Downwind Surface Soil Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS







 $\begin{array}{ll} \textbf{Table A-11} \\ \textbf{SENECA ARMY DEPOT} \\ \textbf{FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

#### SEAD-17 Sediment Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 20

Table A-11<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>FEASIBILITY STUDY

.

#### SEAD-17 Sediment Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 21

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Table A-11} \\ \text{SENECA ARAW DEPOT} \\ \text{FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

#### SEAD-17 Sediment Analytical Results

8W/SD17-9

SW/SD17-8

 $_{\rm LOC\_ID:}$ 





h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 22

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 5 \text{ UJ} \\ 1.6 \text{ J} \\ 5 \text{ UJ} \end{array}$ 

Endosulfan I<br>Endosulfan II Dieldrin

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Table A-11} \\ \text{SENECA ARMY DEPOT} \\ \text{FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

SEAD-17 Sediment Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 23





 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \multicolumn{2}{l}{\textbf{Table A-12}}\\ \multicolumn{2}{l}{\textbf{SENCE A RMY DEPOT}}\\ \multicolumn{2}{l}{\textbf{FFASTBILITY STDY}} \end{tabular}$ 

### SEAD-17 Groundwater Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 1

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Table A-12} \\ \text{SENECA ARMY DEPOT} \\ \text{FEASIBILITY STUDY} \end{array}$ 

SEAD-17 Groundwater Analytical Results

 $rac{1}{2}$ 



 $\label{thm:main} \begin{minipage}{0.9\linewidth} \textit{inig}(\textit{sen}(\textit{val}) \textit{inif}(\textit{dissection2}) \textit{inif}(\textit{ABA,XLS}) \end{minipage}$ 

Page 2





Table A-13<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>FEASIBILITY STUDY

Ÿ.

SEAD-17 Surface Water Analytical Results



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 26

Table A-13<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT<br>FEASIBILITY STUDY

ì.

## SEAD-17 Surface Water Analytical Results

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\17TABA.XLS

Page 27
### **APPENDIX B**

### **RISK ASSESSMENT**

### **ANALYSES**

 $\sim$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ 





DRAFT-REPORT SEAD-16 AND SEAD-17 FS

### **SUMMARY**

### **TABLES**

November 1997



ù.

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 

**SEAD-16** 

November 1997

 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Page\ }D\ \textbf{-1} \\ \textbf{k:\text{8}eneca\text{\textbackslash}S16\&17fs\text{\textbackslash}Text\text{\textbackslash}IDoc} \end{array}$ 

ä



11/03/97

### TABLE 6-41

## CALCULATION OP TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



H:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktab\\totrk16r.wk4

Page 1 of 1

FROM REPORT  $R1/55$ 

103/97

TABLE 6-41

## CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\tilde{\omega}$ 



H:\eng\seneca\s1617rl\risk\human\16\risktab\\totrk16r.wk4

Page 1 of 1

TABLE 6-41

 $\overline{\chi}$ 

# CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/03/97

TABLE 6-41

## CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/03/97

Page 1 of 1

TABLE 6-41

## CALCULATION OF TOTAL NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY SENECA ARMY DEPOT Table 2-1

SEAD-16 SOIL AREAS FOR REMEDIATION



Notes:

1) For Case 3, area to be remediated/excavated includes an additional 24 inches in depth within the areas considered by Case 1 (see Figure 2-1).<br>2) Bold items in Sampling Location Column are additional locations to be reme

h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2\_1-3.XLS





### **SEAD-17**

November 1997

 $\cdot$ 



### Calculation Of Total Noncarcinogenic and Carcinogenic Risks<br>Resonable Maximum Exposure (RME)<br>SEAD 17 - Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



H:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\TOTRK17R.WK4

### Calculation Of Total Noncarcinogenic and Carcinogenic Risks<br>Resonable Maximum Exposure (RME)<br>SEAD 17 - Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



H:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\TOTRK17R.WK4

ÿ

×,

### Calculation Of Total Noncarcinogenic and Carcinogenic Risks<br>Resonable Maximum Exposure (RME)<br>CASE 2 SEAI<br>Se



 $\overline{\mathbf{r}}$ 



H:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\TOTRK17R.WK4

### Calculation Of Total Noncarcinogenic and Carcinogenic Risks<br>Resonable Maximum Exposure (RME)<br>SEAD 17 - Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



H'eng'senece' <<br/>' 617ri'isk\human\l7visktabl\TOTRK17R.WK4

Page 1 of 1

16/60/10 FROM  $R1$  /FS REPORT

**TABLE 7-41** 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

### Calculation Of Total Noncarcinogenic and Carcinogenic Risks<br>Resonable Maximum Exposure (RME)

SEAD 17 - Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



H:\eng\seneca\s1617n\nisk\human\17\nisktab\1OTRK17R.WK4

i,





 $17.958 p. x 15$ 





17 Surf Soil Base Case (Case 0)



17 surface soils case 1



Page 1

 $\bar{t}$ 





17 surface Jolls case 3

¥



 $17 - 553$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 







 $17 - \text{sed} \times 15$ 

17 sediment case 0 and 1



17 gw. Jil Cases



 $17 - 9 - x15$ 

17 surface water all cases



 $17 - 503.21$ 

Pape<sup>1</sup>

17 all soils base (case 0)



 $17 - 5018.16$ 








Page 3

17 all soil case 1 & 2



 $17 - 20i11.815$ 

Page 1

17 all sui, case 1 & 2

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



Page 2

 $\bar{\eta}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

17 all soils case 3



 $17.5113.815$ 

Page 1

17 ali Juls case 3



Page 2

SEAD-16 AND 17 FEASIBILITY STUDY SENECA ARMY DEPOT Table 2-3

SEAD-17 AREAS FOR SOIL REMEDIATION



Notes:

1) For Case 3, area to be remediated/excavated includes an additional 24 inches in depth within the areas considered by Case 1 (see Figure 2-1).<br>2) Bold items in Sampling Location Column are additional locations to be reme

h:\eng\seneca\s1617fs\section2\TAB2\_1-3.XLS

11/197

**TABLE 7-28** 

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

**TABLE 7-28** 

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/05/97

ä,

Page 2 of 2

**TABLE 7-28** 

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



**ABS** = Absorption Factor (unitless)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

1 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car) 70 (Adult Male)

 $AT = Average = A \times \text{rarging Time (days)}$  $\mathrm{BW}=\mathrm{Bodyweight}\left(kg\right)$ 

Applicable for PCBs and Cadmium (EPA, 1992b)

5,800 (RME Adult Worker)<br>1.0 (RME - All Receptors)





### **SEAD-16**

## EPC, INTAKE AND

### **RISK TABLES**

November 1997

 $\sim$ 



 $\cdot$ 

 $16 - 80.615$ 

Page 1

CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Renedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Deput Activity

 $\begin{array}{l} 25.550 \\ 25.550 \\ 25.550 \\ \end{array}$ Averaging Time (days) 888888888888888888888 1,825 Child<br>Body<br>Weight<br>(&) 333 3333333333333333333333 5.2/5.21  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{333}{133}$ 88888888888888888888 Ù 111.44<br>3320.21<br>111.44 888888888888888888888 Compound Specific, EPA, 1992 م 25<br>5 (RME at 1 Residence) 4586.67<br>116152.87<br>22400.00 t. Assumptions: 0.001<br>25 (Child) 4,30E+00<br>3,70E+00<br>2,10E+01  $Tau$  (hours) 22222222222222222222 1.30E+01<br>7.20E+01<br>1.30E+01  $\frac{B}{\text{unilless}}$ 22222222222222222222 Volumetric<br>Conv. Factor<br>(1 liter/1000 cm<sup>1</sup>) EF = Exposure Frequency (days/year)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)<br>OF = Vol. Conv. Factor (1 L/1000 cm<sup>-)</sup><br>B = Bunge Model Value<br>B = Bunge Model Value 1.00E-03<br>1.00E-03<br>1.00E-03 Exposure<br>Duration Child  $(3007)$  $n n n$ nnnnnn  $\begin{tabular}{l} \bf{F}{\bf x}{\bf{p}}{\bf o}{\bf{s}}{\bf u}{\bf{e}} \\ \bf{F}{\bf requency}\\ \bf{(days/em)} \end{tabular}$ Variables: **888888888888888888** 333  $\begin{tabular}{l} \bf{Exposure} \\ \bf{Time} \\ \bf{(boundary)} \end{tabular}$  $- - -$ Calculated from EPA, 1992<br>2,170 (RME Child)<br>1 Compound Specific, EPA, 1992<br>Compound Specific, EPA, 1992  $\begin{tabular}{c} \bf Kp \\ \bf Permeability \\ Coefficient \\ \bf (cmN) \\ \end{tabular}$ 3.30E-02<br>6.50E-01<br>3.30E-02 1.00E-03<br>1.00E-03 DAXSAXKpxETxEFxEDxCF Child<br>Skin Surface<br>Area Contact Assumptions:  $2,170$ <br> $2,170$ <br> $2,170$  $\rm (cm^3)$  $B W x AT$ EPC<br>Surface W.<br><sub>(mg/L)</sub> 3.65E+00<br>5.32E-01 5.00E-04<br>4.00E-03<br>3.00E-03 1,40E-01<br>5.74E-02<br>3.68E-03 1.54E-01<br>1.39E-03<br>7.99E+01<br>1.90E-03 2.31E-03<br>1.12E-01 DA = Absorbed Dose per Event (ing-en<sup>2</sup>ievent)<br>  $\Omega_0 =$  Permeability Coefficient (can<br>  $\Omega_0 =$  Permeability Coefficient (can<br>  $\Omega^* =$  Exposure Time (boursday)<br>
Note: Cells in this table were intentionally if R blank due t Absorbed<br>Dose/Event  $me$ - $cm$ <sup>3</sup>- $ev$  $cm$ 1 9.46E-05<br>1.38E-02<br>1.25E-03 1.40E-04<br>5.74E-05<br>3.68E-06 1345-03<br>1398-03<br>1398-03<br>1385-03<br>1368-03 Child<br>Absorbed<br>Dose (Car)<br>(mg/kg-day) Absorbed Dose (mg/kg-day) = 3.82E-06<br>1.76E-08 1.56E-12 154E-11<br>3.64E-12 Child<br>Absorbed<br>Dose (Ne)<br>(mg/kg-day) 3.41E-10<br>2.19E-11<br>9.16E-10<br>8.27E-12 4.52E-11 6.67E-10 129E-09<br>136E-12<br>231E-11 2.44E-11<br>5.36E-10 1.86E-08<br>5.34E-05<br>2.46E-07 Variables: Di-n-butylphthalate<br>Pentachlorophenol<br>bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate emivolatile Organics EQUATION: Analyte agnesium<br>fanganese<br>Afereury<br>Nickel Cadmium<br>Calcium<br>Chronium<br>Cobalt Aluminum<br>Antimony Potassium<br>Selenium Vanadium Silver<br>Sodium Arsenic pper Metals

-\seneca\s1617n\nsk\human\16\nsktabl\swrk16r.wk4

ie.

Page 1 of 1

11/03/97

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) BASE CASE SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:/eng/senecals1617ri/risk/human/16/risktabl/swrk16r.wk4

11/03/97

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) BASE CASE SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

# $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$







# CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>BASE CASE **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>BASE CASE **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>BASE CASE **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\rightarrow$ 

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **BASE CASE SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to

### TABLE 6-7A

### AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>BASE CASE **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### TABLE 6-7A

## AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>BASE CASE **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



 $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ 

 $\bar{a}$ 

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **BASE CASE SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **EXAMPLE MAXIMON EXPOSORE**<br>
BASE CASE<br>
SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) BASE CASE<br>BASE CASE<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation **Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **BASE CASE SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentra<br>
Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>
Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>BASE CASE<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>BASE CASE<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $AT =$  Averaging Time (days)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) BASE CASE<br>BASE CASE<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



÷,

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **BASE CASE SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Cancer CDI CDI RfC Carc. Slope Hazard Analyte  $(Car)$ Inhalation Quotient **Risk**  $(Nc)$  $(mg/kg-day)-1$ (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) Pesticides NA NA  $4.4'$ -DDD NA  $_{\rm NA}$ 4,4'-DDE 1.55E-12 4.56E-12 3.40E-01 NA  $4,4'-DDT$  $1.72E + 01$ 9.89E-13 4.12E-12 2.40E-13  $1.70E + 01$ 1.68E-11 Aldrin 2.60E-12 4.00E-01 Aroclor-1254 6.50E-12 **NA** NA **NA** Aroclor-1260 8.08E-12  $1.61E + 01$ Dieldrin 5.02E-13 NA NA  $_{\rm NA}$ Endosulfan I **NA** NA Endosulfan II NA **NA** Endosulfan sulfate **NA NA** Endrin **NA** Endrin aldehyde NA Endrin ketone NA **NA**  $6.00E-13$ 1.32E-13 NA 4.55E+00 Heptachlor 2.58E-13 9.10E+00 2.35E-12 NA Heptachlor epoxide  $1.12E + 00$ 1.48E-11  $1.32E-11$ **NA** Toxaphene **NA** alpha-Chlordane **NA** 4.71E-13 1.86E+00 beta-BHC 2.54E-13 NA gamma-BHC (Lindane) NA NA gamma-Chlordane NA NA **Nitroaromatics NA** NA 2-amino-4,6-Dinitrotoluene NA NA Tetryl Metals **NA NA** Antimony 1.97E-02 1.43E-04 **NA** Barium 2.82E-06 **NA** NA Copper NA NA Lead 8.42E-01 7.22E-05 8.57E-05 NA Mercury NA  $NA$ Selenium NA NA Thallium NA NA Zinc **Herbicides** NA NA  $2,4,5-T$ NA NA **MCPP** 3.47E-11 8.62E-01 Total HQ & CR

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.




# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FULVING TRESSPASSER (Chia)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\overline{\mathbf{r}}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

 $\mathcal{N}$ 

í.

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Chia)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

 $\overline{1}$ 

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h; leng senecals 1617 rivisk thuman) 16 visktablisolrk 16r. wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## **TABLE 6-63**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

## **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

h Nenglsenecals 1617 rinisklhumant 16 insktabilsoirk 16r wk4

 $\overline{\bigcirc}$ 

## TABLE & 26<br>CALCULATION OF ARSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSITE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM Investigation<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

Г

TT





CALCULATION OF ABSORED DOSE PROM DERMAL CONTACT<br>REASONALLE MAXISMY RESERVAND REASON CRAFES<br>REASONALLE MAXISMY REASONALLE<br>SERLAGE REAGNALLE MANUFACTURE<br>Series Army Papel Astrity



Page 2 of 3

uman\16\risklabl\soirk16r.wk4

h:\eng\seneca\s16"

11/01/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### **TABLE 6-65**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

## Toxicity Values<br>Soil Medium<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, New York - SEAD 16

 $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ 

-52

ä,



11/01/97



## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSITE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSITE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

Averaging<br>Time<br> $\frac{(dy)}{(dx)}$ 

Body<br>Weight<br> $(kg)$ 

 $\begin{array}{c}\n\text{Exposure} \\
\text{Duration} \\
\text{(yents)}\n\end{array}$ 

Exposure<br>Frequency<br>(day.s/year)

Fraction<br>Ingested<br>(unitless)

 $\begin{array}{ll} \textbf{Conv.} \\ \textbf{Factor} \\ \textbf{(kg/mg)} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Ingestian} \\ \textbf{Rate} \\ \textbf{Rate} \\ \textbf{(mg soiVday)} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{EPC} \\ \text{Soll} \\ \text{(mgNg)} \end{array}$ 

 ${\bf Intake} \; ({\bf C} {\bf a} {\bf r}) \;$   $({\bf m} y {\bf k} y {\bf d} a {\bf y})$ 

Intake (Nc)<br> $(\text{mg/kg} - \text{day})$ 

Analyte

olatile Organics

ន្ទន្ទន្ទន្ទន្ទន្ទ<br>វ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ា

2333333

RRRRRRRR

nnnnnnn

**AAAAAAAA** 

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*<br>\*\*\*\*\*\*\*<br>198888888

88888888

1.40E-10<br>5.59E-11<br>8.39E-11  $1.76E-10$ 

5.72E-10

 $\begin{array}{r} 1.578 + 10 \\ 1.578 + 10 \\ 1.578 + 10 \\ 4.788 + 10 \\ 4.788 + 10 \\ 3.338 + 10 \\ \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} 1.1.2.2\text{-}I\text{-}transhoroethane \\ \text{Aectone} \\ \text{Cefroon D  
Sauliota} \\ \text{Chlorofform} \\ \text{Chlorofen} \\ \text{Iohonlyten} \\ \text{Tohsyten} \\ \text{Iohonylent} \\ \text{Nylent} \\ \text{Oval} \end{array}$ 

3,333

888

1.00E-06<br>1.00E-06<br>1.00E-06

4.02E+00<br>1.11E+00<br>1.11E+00

3.15E-07<br>8.66E-08

4-Dinitrotoluene<br>6-Dinitrotoluene

mivolatile Organics

2.08E-08

3'-Dichlore

1.08E-07 1.12E-07 25,550<br>25,550

9,125

 $88$ 

ដន្

 $88$ 

щщ

1.00E-06<br>1.00E-06

<u>88</u>

8.86E-02<br>8.50E-02

 $6.65E-09$ 

active

 $-4,6$ -Dinitr

etryl

00000000000000000000

RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRR

nanananananananananan

8888888888888888888

3.35E-10<br>4.16E-10

in<br>alfan I<br>alfan II<br>alfan sulfate

347E-11<br>6.80E-11<br>5.47E-09<br>1.60E-11<br>6.68E-11

beta-BHC<br>gamma-BHC (Lindane)<br>gamma-Chlordane<br>delta-BHC

phene<br>-Chlordane

9.72E-11<br>1.90E-10 4.48E-10<br>1.75E-10

marin aldehyde<br>utin kelone<br>utin kelone<br>tachlor epoxide<br>tachlor epoxide

1202-09<br>6322-11<br>6322-09<br>1362-09<br>1322-10

3,36E-09<br>1,77E-10<br>4,79E-09<br>3,70E-10<br>7,00E-10

lor-1254<br>lor-1260

1,50E-10

4.19E-10

 $(4-00D)$ <br> $(4-0D)E$ <br> $(4-0D)T$ 

ticides

Page 1 of 3

h:\eng\seneca\s1

ន្តន្តន្ត្ត<br>ន្ត្រីន្ត ន្ត្រីន្តន្ត្រីន្តន្ត្រីន្តន្ត្រីន្តន្តិន្តន្ត្រីន្តន្ត្រីន្តន្ត្រីន្ត

**QQQQQQQQQQQQQQQQQQQQQ**QQ

RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRR

nnn nnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn

ARA ARARARARARARARARARARARA

888 888888888888888888888888

7.19E-08<br>9.75E-08<br>9.94E-08<br>6.58E-08<br>8.3.9E-08<br>8.3.15E-08

aluormubene<br>uo(g.h.i.)perylene<br>uo(k)fluormubene<br>vole

1,23E-07

butylphthalate<br>nz(a,h)mnthracene

7.68E-08<br>4.63E-08

1,49E-09<br>3.06E-07<br>9.89E-08

oenzofurun<br>ethylphithalate<br>usunilitene

3.16E-08  $5.17E-0.8$ 

8.86E-08

iuorene<br>- Atheodo, 21-edabyteniae (1)<br>- Athulaiene<br>- Amachiorophenol<br>- Canachiorophenol<br>- Pyrene Theory<br>- Pyrene Machiorophyshhalate<br>bist 2-Ethytheory. Pyrenhalate

3.11E-07<br>1.45E-07

 $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ 

11/01/97

CALCULATION OF INTAKE PROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSIVE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSIVE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



o.

 $\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ 

 $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ 

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

## **TABLE 6-45**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### **TABLE 6-45**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da



Page 1 of 3

man\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

h:\eng\seneca\s1P

TABLE -21 TABLE 2023<br>CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DEBMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL

11/01/97

 $\ddot{\bullet}$ 

## TABLE 4:2<br>CALCULATION OF ASSORBED DOSE RROU DERAAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>STE WORKER EXPSE RROU DERBENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSITE (RMB)<br>SEAGLAL A Rean Army Depar Activity



 $\mathcal{R}_{\rm{max}}$ 

 $\tilde{s}$ 

ċ,

h.teng/senecals1617r/trisk/human/16Vrisktabilsoirk16r.wk4

### **TABLE 6-47**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## **TABLE 6-47**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)





Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



Page 1 of 3

h:leng/senecalce hisk/human/16visklabilsoirk16r.wk4

TABLE-13<br>CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRALL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)

11/01/97

TABLE-13<br>INDISTRACT FROM THE INCESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDISTRACT WORK EXPOSITE OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SENECA ARNY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16<br>SENECA ARNY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16



 $\bar{\nu}$ 

h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktabl\solrk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 3

## TABLE 6-44<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD



## TABLE 6-44<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose (Oral)<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor (Oral)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack



Page 1 of 3

nsk/human/16Visktabl/soirk16r.wk4

h:\eng\seneca\

**TABLE 4-9**<br>CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)

11/01/97

CALCULATION OF ARSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL FUTURE PRODUCE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE ARRAYMABLE RESPONSIVE COURSE (RMB)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT,



j.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

## TABLE 6-46<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEA



## TABLE 6-46<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEA



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



 $\bar{\kappa}$ 





16 surf soil .....e case (case 0)



 $16 - 55 \phi \cdot 5 = 51$ 

16 surf soil base case (case 0)



16 surf soil base case (case 0)

No. of

No. of



**Button Co.** 

16 sediment base case & case 1



 $64.802 - 11$ 

16 sediment Lune case & case 1








11/01/97

### TABLE 6-38

Ŷ.

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617rivisk\human\16\risktabl\sedrk16r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

11/01/97



# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



onally lett blank due to a lack of toxicity data. Note: Cells in this table were inter Page 2 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

11/01/97

### **TABLE 6-73**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

11/01/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h: englsenecals1617 rivisk thuman/16 trisktablised rk16r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Jsenecals1617nlvisk\human\16\visktabl\sedrk16r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\sedrk16r.wk4

11/01/97

### **TABLE 6-71**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.





16 all soil being case (case 0)



 $|a - 201| \phi.8$ 

Page 1

16 all soil base case (case 0)

 $\lambda$ 



Page 2

16 all soil L. Case (case 0)

No. of





### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INCESTION OF SIRFACE & SIBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REAGONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)





ecals1617n/riskVhuman\16Vrisktabf/subrk16r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

11/03/97

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INCESTION OF SIIRFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Invertigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:leng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktabl\subrk16r.wk4

 $\bar{\phantom{a}}$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE  $\&$  SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SUBFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation



ecals1617n/riskVhuman116/risktabl\subrk16r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

11/03/97

11/03/97

CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SUBFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL.<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

ត្ត<br>ក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងក្នុង<br>ក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងក្នុង 25,550<br>25,550  $\begin{array}{c}\n\text{Average} \\
\text{Time} \\
\text{(days)} \\
\hline\n\end{array}$ 250 (RME Construction Worker) 1 (Upper bound limit for CW)<br>70 (Adult Male)<br>1 x 365 (Ne) 70 x 365 (Car) \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 365 Assumptions: Body<br>Weight<br>(kg) **88888888**  $\frac{07}{20}$ Exposure<br>Duration<br>(years) EF = Exposure Frequency (days/year)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)<br>BW = Bodyweight (kg)<br>AT = Averaging Time (days)  $-1$ داما ماما  ${\small \begin{array}{c} \text{Exposure} \\ \text{Frequency} \\ \text{(days/can)} \end{array}}$ និនិនិនិនិនិនិ 250<br>250 Skin Surface Adherence Absorption<br>Area Contact Factor Factor<br>(cm<sup>3</sup>) (eng soil/cm<sup>3</sup>) (unitiess) Variables: 10-6<br>5,800 (RME Adult Worker)<br>1.0 (RME - All Receptors)<br>Applicable for PCBs and Cadmium (EPA, 1992b) 99999999  $^{0.0}_{-0.1}$ Absorbed Dose (mg/kg-day) = CS 1 CF 1 SA 1 AF 1 ABS 1 EF 1 ED EPC - Total Soil Data (RME)  $BW \times AT$ 5,800<br>5,800 **Assumptions:** Conv.<br>Factor<br>(kg/mg) 88888888<br>1888888888<br>188888888 1,00E-06<br>1,00E-06 ABS = Absorption Factor (unitiess)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.  $\begin{tabular}{|c|c|} \hline \texttt{Dec} \\ \hline \texttt{Dose (Car)} & \texttt{Total Solis} \\ \hline \texttt{(mg/kg-day)} & \texttt{(mg/kg)} \\ \hline \end{tabular}$ 4.03E-03<br>4.33E+00  $\begin{array}{l} \text{CS}=\text{Chemical Construction in } \text{Soil}\ (\text{mg} \text{ willrg})\\ \text{CF}=\text{Conversion Factor} \ (\text{U6-4})\text{g/mg})\\ \text{SA}=\text{Surface Areacdot (U6-4})\text{mg})\\ \text{AF}=\text{Soil}\ \text{to} \ \text{Skin Adherence Factor (mg/cm^3)} \end{array}$  $\begin{array}{c|c} \textbf{Dose (Nc)} \\ \textbf{(mgkg-day)} \end{array}$ Analyte EQUATION: Herbicides **Variables:** Antimony<br>Barium<br>Copper<br>Lead Mercury<br>Selenium<br>Thallium<br>Zinc 2,4,5-T<br>MCPP Metals

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.









 $-\frac{1}{6}$   $6\frac{6}{3}$   $6\frac{1}{3}$  $\epsilon$ 

Page 1

16 building ....  $e$  case (case 0)  $\left($  **USA**  $\rightarrow$  **0)**  $\rightarrow$  **0)** 



16 buildling base case (case 0)

Page 2

16 buildling L 3 case (case 0)

12817.632 95th UCL of Mean  $EPC$ <br>12817.632 1 No. of No. of<br>Valid Rejected No. of<br>Analyses SQLs Hits Freq. (%) Mean Std. Dev. Max. Hit Normal? ?<br>Analyses SQLs Hits Freq. (%) Mean Of Std. Dev. Max. Hit Normal? ? Units<br>UG/KG Parameter<br>MCPP

Class<br>HERBICIDES







### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO INDOOR DUST INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



s.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO INDOOR DUST INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

### **Toxicity Values** Soil Medium REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**


# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF INDOOR DUST<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

11/03/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF INDOOR DUST<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

## **TABLE 6-28**

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF INDOOR DUST<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



## Variables:

 $CS =$  Chemical Concentration (mg solid/kg)<br>IR = Ingestion Rate (mg solid/day)<br>CF = Conversion Factor (10-6 kg/mg) FI = Fraction Ingested (unitless)<br>EF = Exposure Frequency (days/years)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)<br>BW = Bodyweight (kg)<br>AT = Averaging Time (days)

EPC Solid Data - RME<br>100 (RME Adult Worker)<br>10-6 1 (All Receptors)<br>250

25 (RME Adult Worker)<br>70 (Adult male)<br>25 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INGESTION OF INDOOR DUST<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

#### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF INDOOR DUST<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

#### **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO INDOOR DUST FUTURE WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



EQUATION:

Variables:

Assumptions:

CS x CF x SA x AF x ABS x EF x ED

Variables:

EF = Exposure Frequency (events/year)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)<br>BW = Bodyweight (kg)<br>AT = Averaging Time (days)

#### Assumptions:

250 (RME Adult Worker)<br>25 (RME Adult Worker)<br>70 (Adult Male)<br>25 x 365 (Ne) 70 x 365 Adult (Car)

Absorbed dose (mg/kg-day) =









 $2^{3}$ . Ilios - al

16 all soils case 1 and 2



16 all so<sub>lv</sub> case 1 and 2

 $\begin{array}{c} 105.433 \\ 1.629 \\ 23.373 \end{array}$ 110.008 EPC Std. Dev. Max. Hit Normal? ?<br>
743 68.708 383.000 FALSE TRUE 0105.433<br>
739 7.477 1.700 FALSE FALSE 1.629<br>
76 6.622 38.100 FALSE TRUE 23.373<br>
16 37.860 219.000 FALSE TRUE 110 000 1<br>
16 37.860 219.000 FALSE TRUE 110 000 1 82.743 21.076<br>98.416 1.839  $\begin{tabular}{llllll} \bf Hits & Freq. (%) Mean \\ 0 & 24 & 70.6\% & 82.74 \\ 0 & 10 & 29.4\% & 1.83 \\ 0 & 34 & 100.0\% & 21.07 \\ 0 & 34 & 100.0\% & 98.41 \\ \end{tabular}$ No. of No. of<br>Valid Rejected No. of<br>Analyses SQLs Hits 1  $\circ$  $\circ$  $\circ$  $\circ$ 3333 MG/KG<br>MG/KG<br>MG/KG MG/KG Units Vanadium Parameter Thallium Sodium Zinc **METALS**<br>METALS **METALS METALS** Class



16 surface soil case 1  $\zeta$  2

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $16 - 551.615$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



OTHER ANALYSE

**PESTICIDES/PCB** 

PESTICIDES/PCB PESTICIDES/PCB

**PESTICIDES/PCB** 

PESTICIDES/PCB PESTICIDES/PCB **PESTICIDES/PCB PESTICIDES/PCB PESTICIDES/PCB PESTICIDES/PCB** PESTICIDES/PCB PESTICIDES/PCB

**METALS** 

**METALS** 

**METALS** METALS METALS METALS **METALS METALS METALS** 

METALS

Silver

**METALS METALS** METALS **METALS METALS METALS METALS METALS METALS METALS** 

# 16 surface soil case 1

**PESTICIDES/PCB**<br>PESTICIDES/PCB

Class

Valid No. of

Rejected No. of

Lognormal 95th UCL

No. of

**FALSE** 

0.338

16 surface soil case 1

METALS

**METALS** 

METALS Class

METALS

Sodium Zinc Vanadium Parameter Thallium MG/KG<br>MG/KG<br>MG/KG **MG/KG** Units No. of No. of<br>Valid Rejected No. of<br>Analyses SQLs Hits I 33524  $\circ$ Hits Freq. (%) Mean  $\begin{array}{ccc} 24 & 70.6\% \\ 10 & 29.4\% \\ 34 & 100.0\% \\ 34 & 100.0\% \end{array}$  $\begin{array}{r} 82.743 \\ 1.839 \\ 21.076 \\ 98.416 \end{array}$ Std. Dev. Max. Hit Normal?<br>
43 68.708 383.000 FALSE TR<br>
39 7.477 1.700 FALSE FA<br>
76 68.72 38.100 FALSE FA<br>
76 6.622 38.100 FALSE TR  $\begin{array}{r} 68.708 \\ 7.477 \\ 6.622 \\ 37.860 \end{array}$ 219.000 FALSE Lognormal 95th UCL of Mean 110.008 105.433 23.373 1.629 **EPC** 110.008 105.433 23.373 1.629





ý,

11/03/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investgation<br>Seneca Army Depta Activity



h:/eng/senecals1617n/riskVhuman\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

h:leng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktabl\Soirk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 3

TABLE 6-20

CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)





### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 1<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



#### **TABLE 6-63**

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da



 $\bigcirc$ 

TABLE 4:36<br>CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>REASONABLE MACKER RESOURCE (RAE)<br>REASONABLE MACKER RESOURCE (RAE)

11/03/97

Page 1 of 3

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\solrk16r.wk4

CALCULATION OF ABSOBBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>REASONALE MAXIMINA EXPANSION (RME)<br>REASONALE MAXIMINA EXPANSION (RME)<br>READ-16 REGALE In external and





Page 2 of 3

A16VisktabNsoirk16r wk4

h lengisenecals1617ritrisktw

1003/87

#### **TABLE 6-65**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 1<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

Seneca Army Depot Activity



#### **TABLE 6-65**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 1

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da



 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\overline{O}$ 

CALCULATION OF INTAKE PROM THE INCESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WONNELE MAXIMUM EXPOSITE LAND USE)<br>REAGNABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSITE LAND USE)<br>READ-16 READ - CASE 1<br>CASE 1





h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabf\soirk16r.wk4

Page 1 of 3



CALCULATION OF INTAKE PROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>STEE WORKER E MAXIMUM EXPOSITE LAND USE)<br>REAGONER E MAXIMUM EXPOSITE (PARE)<br>SERLD-16 Rand Army Inversation<br>Sereca Army Depat Activity



Page 2 of 3

Mumant Strisktablisoirk16r.wk4

h:\eng\seneca\s1P

1009/7

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

TRABLE MAXIMOM EXPOSURE<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



#### **TABLE 6-45**

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army D





Ļ

TABLE 6-22

# CALCULATION OF ABSOREED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKELE MAXIMUM EURENT LAND USE)<br>REAGNAELE MAXIMUM EURENT LAND USE)<br>REAGNAELE MAXIMUM EURENT LAND USE)<br>SERADA 6 Renes Army Depat Actrity.

25,550

 $9.125$ <br> $9.125$ 

 $RR$ 

nn

 $\mathbb{S}^2$ 

 $200$ 

5,800

1.00E-06<br>1.00E-06

 $\frac{2\text{-anino-4.6-1}Nntirotoluene}{\text{Tetry1}}$ 



Page 2 of 3

16Visktabl\soirk16r.wk4

h lengisenecals1617n

ÿ.

TABLE 6-22

#### **TABLE 6-47**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



#### **TABLE 6-47**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 1<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



CALCULATION OF INTAKE TROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDISTRACING A REPORT FOR THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDISTRACING A REPORT FOR THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4



Page 2 of 3

h:leng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktabNsolrk16r.wk4

11/03/97

### TABLE 6-44<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD CASE 1



 $\bar{\mathbf{r}}$ 

 $\overline{z}$ 

## TABLE 6-44<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose (Oral)<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor (Oral)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack


ä

CALCULATION OF ABSOBBED DO TABLE 6-19<br>FULURE WORKER EXP FORME (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>FUTURE WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>SENE REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RAIE)<br>SENE REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RAIE)

11/03/97

Page 1 of 3

h:leng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktab\\soirk16r.wk4

ġ.

TABLE 4: 9<br>FUTURE MORER DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

11/03/97



Page 2 of 3

# TABLE 6-46<br>
CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>
FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>
INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK



11/03/97

11/03/97

# TABLE 6-46<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEA CASE 1



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.





# **CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE) EROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**<br>CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



ż

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS TION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGE<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>
Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>
Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due t

### TABLE 6-7A

# AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $\sim$ 

# TABLE 6-7A

# AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
CASE 1

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 1<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



×,

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**CASE 1**<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 1<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 1<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Q.

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**EXAMPLE MAXIMON EXPOSURE<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

11/03/97

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE I

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



w

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>CASE I<br>CARE AND USE CARE I **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to





 $\texttt{TABLE}$  6-18

CALCULATION OF BYTAKE FROM INCESTION OF SUBFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Inverigation



 $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ 

Page 1 of 2

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INCESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>READ-16 Remedial Investigation



11/03/97

Page 2 of 2

# $\begin{array}{ll} \textbf{CALCULATION OF NONCARCHIOGENIC AND CARCHIOGENIC RISKS} \\ \textbf{FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUB SURFACE SOL} \end{array}$ **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

Seneca Army Depot Activity



ī.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 1 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SUBPACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REAGONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investgeion



CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



11/03/97

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **CASE1**

# **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE1**

# **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



# Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.





# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

11/03/97



 $\texttt{TABLE}$  6-22

1008011

skihumani16visktablisoirk16r.wk4

h:\eng\seneca\s1f



11/03/97

Page 2 of 3

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\10\risktabNsoirk16r.wk4

 $11/03/07$ 

# **TABLE 6-47**

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Ac


# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Ac



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

ò.



Page 1 of 3

h:/eng/seneca/s1617rVdskVhuman\16Visktabl\solrk16r.wk4

TABLE 6-13

11/03/97



 $\bar{\alpha}$ 

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\solrk16r.wk4

11/03/97

## TABLE 6-44<br>
CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>
FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>
INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK -



Page 1 of 3

## TABLE 6-44<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose (Oral)<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor (Oral)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack



Page 1 of 3

h:leng/senecals1517/MskVhuman\16Vrisktabl/solrk18r.wk4

**TABLE 4-9**<br>CALCULATION OF ARSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE AND STRAIN RAPORT REPOSITE INTO USE IS DESCRIPTION ON THE SOIL

11/03/97



**CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL** 

h:leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 3

11/03/97

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

11/03/97

## TABLE 6-46<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEA CASE 2



## TABLE 6-46<br>
CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>
FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>
INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 







# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INCESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMENT EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ 

11/03/97



25,550<br>25,550<br>25,550

ន្ត<br>ត្តិន្ទុន្តិន្ទុន្តិន្ទុន្តិន្ទុន្តិន្ទុន្តិន្ទុន្តិន្ទុន្តិន្ទុន្តិ<br>ត្តិស្តារាំង ត្តិន្ទុន្តិ

 $- - - -$ 

2.14E-06 8.03E-06<br>1.39E-05<br>1.39E-06

Ayrene<br>vis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate

ត្ត<br>ត្តត្តត្តត្តត្ត<br>ពុំពុំពុំពុំពុំពុំពុំព

h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

h:\eng\seneca\s1<sup>c^\*\*\*</sup>\risk\human\16\dsktabl\solrk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 3

**TABLE 6-20** 

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>REASONABLE MAXIME FRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIME FROSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation



11/03/97

#### 11/03/97

#### **TABLE 6-63**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/03/97

#### **TABLE 6-63**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



# TARLE A-26<br>CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO<br>REASONABLE MAXIME SUSPENSIBLE (RMB)<br>REASONABLE MAXIME DOSED RABBI



CALCULATION OF ARSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>REASONALE MAXIMUM EXPORTER<br>REASONALE MAXIMUM EXPORTER<br>REASONALE MAXIMUM EXPORTER<br>Sensed Army Deput Activity<br>Sensed Army Deput Activity

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 





Page 2 of 3

h, lengisenecals 1617rivisk/human\16utsktablisoirk16r.wk4

11/03/97

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

#### 11/03/97

#### **TABLE 6-65**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

#### **Seneca Army Depot Activity**



11/03/97

#### **TABLE 6-65**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

.

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabitscirk16r.wk4

 $\begin{tabular}{l} \textbf{7.1812.6} & \textbf{7.1812.6} & \textbf{8.182} \\ \textbf{7.182.7} & \textbf{8.183.7} & \textbf{9.183.7} \\ \textbf{8.183.7} & \textbf{9.183.7} & \textbf{1.183.7} \\ \textbf{1.184.7} & \textbf{1.184.7} & \textbf{1.185.7} \\ \textbf{1.185.7} & \textbf{1.185.7} & \textbf{1.185.7} \\ \textbf{1.185.7} & \textbf{$ 

П



Page 2 of 3

h:teng'senecald.1617. "HKhuman\16VisktabRisolrk16r.wk4

11/03/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 2<br>
SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Activity



¥





### **CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



## CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to

#### TABLE 6-7A

#### AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



#### TABLE 6-7A

### AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
CASE 2 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



 $\blacksquare$ 

#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot



# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to
#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 2 SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



ÿ

#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE<sub>2</sub>

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



AT = Averaging Time (days)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

Seneca Army Depot Activity



ò.

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 

Cancer Hazard CDI **CDI** RfC Carc. Slope Analyte Risk **Inhalation** Quotient  $(Nc)$  $(Car)$ (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day)-1 (mg/kg-day) Pesticides NA  $4,4'-DDD$ NA  $4,4$ '-DDE NA NA 1.05E-12 NA 3.40E-01 3.55E-13 4,4'-DDT  $0.00E + 00$  $1.70E + 01$  $1.72E + 01$  $0.00E + 00$  $0.00E + 00$  $0.00E + 00$ Aldrin 4.00E-01  $0.00E + 00$  $0.00E + 00$ Aroclor-1254 **NA** NA **NA** Aroclor-1260 8.54E-12  $1.61E + 01$ 5.30E-13 NA Dieldrin NA NA Endosulfan I NA NA Endosulfan II NA NA Endosulfan sulfate NA **NA** Endrin **NA NA** Endrin aldehyde **NA** NA Endrin ketone  $0.00E + 00$ 4.55E+00  $0.00E + 00$ NA Heptachlor 1.87E-12 2.06E-13 NA 9.10E+00 Heptachlor epoxide  $0.00E + 00$ NA  $1.12E + 00$  $0.00E + 00$ Toxaphene NA NA alpha-Chlordane  $1.86E + 00$ 4.83E-13 2.61E-13 **NA** beta-BHC gamma-BHC (Lindane) **NA** NA NA **NA** gamma-Chlordane **Nitroaromatics** NA **NA** 2-amino-4,6-Dinitrotoluene **NA NA** Tetryl Metals  $_{\rm NA}$ NA Antimony 1.43E-04 NA 1.97E-02 2.82E-06 Barium **NA NA** Copper **NA** Lead **NA** 8.42E-01 8.57E-05 NA Mercury 7.22E-05  $_{\rm NA}$ NA Selenium NA NA Thallium NA NA Zinc **Herbicides**  $2,4,5-T$ NA NA NA NA **MCPP** 8.62E-01  $1.14E-11$ Total HQ & CR

> Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.









 $16 - 553$   $515$ 

16 surface soils case 3



16 surfa oils case 3

0.875 24.081<br>105.181 of Mean EPC  $\begin{array}{c} 0.875 \\ 24.081 \\ 105.181 \end{array}$ Lognormal 95th UCL **FALSE**<br>TRUE FALSE  $\begin{tabular}{llllll} \textbf{Sid Dev. Max. Hit} & \textbf{Normal? ?} \\ 1 & 0.401 & 1.700 \textbf{ FALSE} & \textbf{F} \\ 6 & 6.780 & 38.100 \textbf{ FALSE} & \textbf{F} \\ 7 & 33.894 & 219.000 \textbf{ FALSE} & \textbf{T} \\ \end{tabular}$ No. of No. of<br>
Valid Rejected No. of<br> *i* Analyses SQLs Hits Freq. (%) Mean<br> *N*CG 31 0 9 29.0% 0.551<br>
<sup>21</sup> 0 31 100.0% 21.50 0.551<br>21.506<br>94.427 Units  $A$ <br>MG/KG MG/KG<br>MG/KG Parameter<br>Thallium Vanadium Zinc

Class<br>METALS

**METALS**<br>METALS

16 all soils case 3



 $2\frac{3.5}{3.2}$ 

16 all June Case 3



16 all soils case 3







CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SUBFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKAR EXPOSERS (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REAGNEMENT REAGNEMENT CASE 3<br>SEAL: A CASE 3<br>SEAL: A DATE INTERNATION CASE



25,550<br>25,550

365

 $70^{\circ}$ 

 $-1$ 

**250** 

 $\rightarrow$   $\rightarrow$ 

480<br>480

 $0.00E+00$ 

2-amino-4,6-Dinitrotoluene<br>Tetryl

Page 1 of 2

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



# TABI

CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASON REASON CORRESPOSURE (RUTHE LAND USE)<br>SEA LA G CARRE LAND



enecals1617riviskVnuman\16Visktablisubrk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



 $\sim$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SUBFACE & SUBSURACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURI LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation





CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WERE REAL MARKED OF USED A LAND USE)<br>CONSTRUCTION WERE MAXIMUM EXPERIE RELAND USE)



Page 2 of 2

neca's1617riviskVhuman\16visktablisubrk16r.wk4

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>3</sub>

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>3</sub>

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# Toxicity Values<br>
Surface and Subsurface Soil Medium<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
Seneca Army Depot, Romulus, New York - SEAD 16<br>
CASE 3







# CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



## CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to

#### TABLE 6-7A

## AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
CASE 3<br>
SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation **Seneca Army Depot Activity**



#### TABLE 6-7A

# AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
CASE 3<br>
SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Activity



### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# $\begin{tabular}{c} CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR \\ \begin{tabular}{c} STE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) \\ REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) \\ CASE 3 \\ SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation \\ \end{tabular} \end{tabular}$



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity dat

 $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}$ 

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot



 $\langle \epsilon \rangle$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to
## $\begin{tabular}{c} CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR \end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} CONSTRUCITION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) \end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} \textbf{REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) } \\ \textbf{CASE 3} \\ \textbf{SEAD-16 Remelial Investigation } \\ \textbf{SERA Army Depot Activity} \end{tabular}$



# $\begin{tabular}{c} CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR \cr CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) \cr REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) \cr CASE 3 \\ \cr SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation \cr Seneca Army DeptoA activity \cr \end{tabular}$



 $AT = \text{Average Time (days)}$ <br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

¥

11/03/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



 $\overline{c}$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to





 $\bigcirc$ 

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>REASONABLE MAXINIM EXPOSIURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXINIM EXPOSIURE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Renedal Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:leng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktabhsolrk16r.wk4

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

11/03/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>REASONABLE MAXIME SPOSER (GMd)<br>REASONABLE MAXIME SPOSERE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial investigation



h:lengisenecals. <sup>=-n</sup>idsk/human16visktabliselik16r.wk4

Page 2 of 3

#### **TABLE 6-63**

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



#### **TABLE 6-63**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 





 $\frac{1}{\mathcal{O}}$ 

CALCULATION OF ARSOREED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL.<br>REASONABLE MACURE TRESSPASSER (Chia)<br>REASONABLE MACURE TRESSPASSER (RME)

11/03/97

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabhsoirk16r.wk4

 $\bar{\alpha}$ 

ÿ.

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{7.811} & \textbf{7.82} & \textbf{7.83} & \textbf{8.83} \\ \textbf{7.81} & \textbf{8.83} & \textbf{8.84} & \textbf{8.85} \\ \textbf{7.83} & \textbf{8.86} & \textbf{8.87} & \textbf{8.87} \\ \textbf{8.85} & \textbf{8.87} & \textbf{8.87} & \textbf{8.87} \\ \textbf{8.87} & \textbf{8.87} & \textbf{8.87} & \textbf{8.87} \\ \textbf{8.87} & \$ 



 $\bar{z}$ 

Page 2 of 3

thuman16trisktablisoirk16r.wk4

h:\ing\seneca\s"

11/03/97

#### **TABLE 6-65**

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



#### **TABLE 6-65**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>
FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>
FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
CASE 3<br>
SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>
SPAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Page 2 of 3

# TABLE 4-16<br>CALCULATION OF INTAKE ROW THE ROESTION OF ONSITE SOLIS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSITE (CUREENT LAND USE)<br>REAGNABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSITE (RME)<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation





h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabhsoirk16r.wk4

CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INCESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WOONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (NHE)<br>REACONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (NHE)<br>SEAD-16 Reachill investigation





Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617mmsk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 3

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 3

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity





 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

#### **TABLE 6-45**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3

**SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

Page 2 of 3

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\scirk16r wk4

Body<br>Weight<br>(kg) RRR RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRR 88888888888888888888 RRRRRRRR Exposure<br>Duration<br>(years) aaa aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa ........................... aaaaaaaa Exposure<br>Frequency<br>(events/year) aaa aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa 8888888888888888888 **SSSSSSS** Absorption<br>Factor<br>(unitless)  $\frac{9.06}{0.06}$  $\begin{tabular}{|c|c|} \hline \multicolumn{1}{c}{Stin Surface} & Athereence \\ \multicolumn{1}{c}{Area Constant} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{Factor} \\ \multicolumn{1}{c}{(cm)} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{Factor} \\ \multicolumn{1}{c}{(cm')} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{(cm)} \\ \multicolumn{1}{$ 99999999 999 9999999999999999999999999 99999999999999999999 5,800<br>5,800<br>5,800 Conv.<br>Factor<br>(kg/mg) 1.00E-06<br>1.00E-06<br>1.00E-06 704503<br>8.38503<br>8.380503<br>8.380503<br>8.38503<br>7.38503 1.12E+00<br>1.80E-01<br>1.38E+00 우국우우주주우우주주국우우역구우우주국우우주국<br>대학원(대학원) 대학원(국가국무역구축) 대학원<br>대학원(대학원) 대학원 대학원 대학원 대학원 대학원  $1.67E-03$ 2,29E-03<br>1,82E-03<br>1,64E-03<br>1,64E-03  $\begin{array}{c} \text{EPC} \\ \text{Soill} \\ \text{Ingfkg)} \end{array}$ 321E-03<br>1.81E-02<br>8.71E-03  $\begin{array}{l} \text{Dose (Car)}\\ \text{(mg/kg-dax)} \end{array}$ 1.86E-09  $\begin{array}{l} \text{Dose (Ne)}\\ \text{(mp/kg-day)} \end{array}$ as(1,2,3-ed)pyrene<br>trosodiphenylamine (1) 2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate 1,2,2,-Tetrachloroethane cta-BHC<br>amma-BHC (Lindane)<br>amma-Chlordane<br>clta-BHC ivolatile Organics Analyte roform<br>hylene Chloride hthalene<br>achlorophenol<br>aatibrene Intile Organics ctone<br>xzene<br>tbon Disulfide sene<br>ene (total) adrin<br>*indrin aldehyde*<br>[Endrin ketone<br>|romatics  $:10r-1254$ <br> $:10r-1260$ 

ana nasanananananananananananan<br>1111 hainanananananananananan

**AAA AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA** 

TABLE 6-22

CALCULATION OF ABSOREED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER E MAXIMINI EXPOSITE (AND USE)<br>REASONARE MAXIMINI EXPOSITE (MATE)<br>SEADLE (ANE 3<br>Seach Army Departantly)

 $\frac{\text{Average}}{\text{Time}}$ 

 $\begin{smallmatrix} 8 & 8 & 8 & 8 & 8 & 8 & 8 & 8 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 &$ 

2223233

25,550<br>25,550

3,125

 $RR$ 

**23.23** 

នន

 $0.0$ 

5,800

1.00E-06<br>1.00E-06

emino-4.6-Dinitro<br>Tetryl

000000000000000000000

Page 1 of 3

11/03/97



CALCULATION OF ARSONULD DOSE RROM DERMAL CONTRACTOR (STANDARD ACTION CASE)<br>REACTOR MANAGEMENT MANAGEMENT CASES<br>REACTOR MANAGEMENT CASES<br>LANGER CONTRACTOR CASES (STANDARD ACTION)<br>LANGER CASES (STANDARD ACTION)<br>Served Model

 $\texttt{TABLE}$  6-22



Page 2 of 3

h:\eng\seneca\s1613.1http://thuman\16\risktabhsoirk18r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



#### **TABLE 6-47**

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-16 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Ac



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



**CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS**<br>INDISTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>INDISTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)

11/03/97

h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\16\risktabl\solrk16r.wk4

TABLE 4:13<br>INDUSTRIAL WARE FROM THE GESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRIAL WARKE FROM THE GUITIRE LAND USE)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16

į,



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:leng/senecals1617riviskVhuman\16VisktabNsolrk16r.wk4

Page 2 of 3

11/03/97

 $\ddot{\cdot}$ 

## TABLE 6-44<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD



## TABLE 6-44<br>
CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>
FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>
INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK -



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose (Oral) Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor (Oral) Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4



CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DO TABLE 6-19<br>DETURE WORKER EXPAND FUTURE LAND USE)<br>- REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>- REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

11/03/97

h:leng\seneca\s1617rl\risk\human\16\risktabl\soirk16r.wk4

**CALCULATION OF ARSORED DOSE FROM DEVELOPMACION ACTIVITY ON SITE SOIL**<br>FUTURE WORKER ARYONDE FUTURE LAND USE)<br>FUTURE WORKER MAXYOUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEAD 16



I

Page 2 of 3

h:leng\seneca\s" "risk\human\16\risktabNsolrk16r.wk4

11/03/97

# TABLE 6-46<br>
CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>
FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>
INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK



 $\tilde{\omega}$ 

## TABLE 6-46<br>CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL (DAILY)<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SENECA ARMY DEPOT, ROMULUS, NEW YORK - SEA CASE 3



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.





 $\omega$ 

#### **SEAD-17**

#### EPC, INTAKE AND

#### **RISK TABLES**





17 Surf Soil Baue Case (Case 0)

## Page 1

 $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ 

17 Surf Soil Base Case (Case 0)

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



Page 2
17 all soils  $\ldots$  case (case 0)

 $\bigl($ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



Page 1





Page 2





Page 1

17 sediment case 0 and 1



Page 2

17 surface ... ater all cases

 $\bar{\nu}$ 



17 gw all cases



Lebua





## CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **EXAMPLE THE TRESSPASSER (Child)**<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to

### TABLE 7-7A

# AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### TABLE 7-7A

### AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)





Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

11/19/97

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



ý

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)





 $AT = Averaging Time (days)$ <br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration

Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### **CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)** FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)







# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/19/97

ł.

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Page 2 of 2

h:leng\seneca\s1617r" "uman\17\risktabl\sedtk17r.wk4

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity





Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

ÿ.

11/19/97

J.

# **TABLE 7-36**

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ndsk\human\17\risktabl\sedrk17r.wk4

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-71**

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da




# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

.

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

i,



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

**TABLE 7-22** 

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

Page 1 of 2

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity





# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/19/97

h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2



11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



EQUATION:

Absorbed Dose (mg/kg-day) = CS x CF x SA x AF x ABS x EF x ED  $BW xAT$ 

Variables:

CS = Chemical Concentration in Soil (mg soil/kg)  $SA = Surface Area Contact (cm<sup>2</sup>)$   $AF = Solid to Skin Adherence Factor (mg/cm<sup>2</sup>)$  $\mathbb{CP} = \mathbb{C}$ onversion Factor (10-6 kg/mg)  $\text{ABS} = \text{Absorption Factor (unildes)}$ 

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Compound Specific PCBs and Cd (EPA, 1992b) 1.0 (RME all receptors) EPC Soil Data - RME 2,300 (RME Child)  $10-6$ 

(Default Assumption  $0\% = 0.0$ )

50 (RME)<br>5 (RME)<br>25 kg (child)<br>5 x 365 (Nc), 70 x 365 (Car) Assumptions:  $EF = Exposure Frequency (events/year)$  $\begin{aligned} \text{ED} = \text{Exposure Duration (years)}\\ \text{BW} = \text{Bodyweight (kg)} \end{aligned}$ 

Variables:

Assumptions:

 $AT = Averageing Time (days)$ 

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



Sheet No. 1

Page 9

DEQ Form 805 6/16/97



NOTE: 1). Enclosed with downward louvers.

DEQForm8056/16/97

Page9

Sheet No. 2



Page9

DEQForm8056/16/97

Sheet No. 3



NOTE:<br>1) Stack 4-6 is designated for start-up use for SG-1 and SG-2.<br>2) Stack 4-4 is designated for start-up use for SG-3 and SG-4.

DEQForm8056/16/97

Page9

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\hat{\nu}$ 



h:/eng/senecals1617rivisk/human/17visktabl/soirk17r.wk4

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



h englsenecals 1617 rivisk human 17 visktabl soirk 17 r. wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

**TABLE 7-16** 

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 3 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

í,



11/19/97

# **TABLE 7-18**

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

# SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Page 3 of 2

# CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



hilengisenecais1617 riviskihumani17 visktablisoirk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

11/19/97



11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\nsk\human\17\nsktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2



# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\nsk\human\17\nsktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97
## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4





## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose

Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\swrk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 1

25 (Child)<br>Compound Specific, EPA, 1992

Compound Specific, EPA, 1992

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h neng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\swrk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.







## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

X.

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

Page 3 of 2

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

l,

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

í.



· genecals1617rivisk/human\17visktablsubrk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

 $\bar{a}$ 

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

11/19/97

## **TABLE 7-28**

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

AF=Soil to Skin Adherence Factor (mg/cm<sup>2</sup>)  $\overline{ABS} = Absorption Factor (unitless)$ 

1 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

 $AT = Averageing Time (days)$ 

Applicable for PCBs and Cadmium (EPA, 1992b)

1.0 (RME - All Receptors)

h:leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

**Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Can** 

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.







17 all supplies 1 & 2

No. of

17 all soil case 1 & 2



 $\sim$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\mu$  eses signs and  $\mu$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 



17 surface soils case 1







## CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $\epsilon$ 

 $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ 

## **CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)**<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



**AT** = Averaging Time (days) Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**





Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

## TABLE 7-7A

## AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## TABLE 7-7A

## AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**


## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



ä.

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\17\risktabl\airrik17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)**<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Sp.

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



nhalation Kate (m'/day)  $EF = Exposure Frequency (days/yr)$  $ED = Exposure\;Duration\; (years)$ 

250 (RME Construction Workers) 1 (Upper bound period of Construction Worker) 70 (Adult Male) 1 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

 $AT = Averageing Time (days)$ Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

 $BW = Bodyweight (kg)$ 

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

V

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



 $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ 

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Variables:

CA = Chemical Concentration in Air (mg/m<sup>3</sup>)  $IR = Inhalation Rate (m<sup>3</sup>/day)$  $EF = Exposure Frequency (days/yr)$  $ED = Exposure\;Duration\; (years)$  $BW = Bodyweight (kg)$ 

## **Assumptions:**

**Calculated EPC Air Data - RME** 20 (all receptors) 250 (RME Industrial Workers) 5 70 (Adult Male) 5 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

 $AT = Averageing Time (days)$ Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



.

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.





# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabl\sedrk17r.wk4

ğ.

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>REASONABLE MAXINUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXINUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation





Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\n<k\human\17\nsktabl\sedrk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sence Army Depo



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 1





11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Invesigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617rNrisk\human\17\risktabl\sedrk17r.wk4

11/19/97

## **TABLE 7-71**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 1 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Child Child Cancer Hazard **R<sub>m</sub>** Oral  $CDI$  $CDI$ Quotient Risk **Slope Factor**  $(Nc)$  $(Car)$ Analyte  $(mg/kg-day)-1$ (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) **Volatile Organics** 7.88E-08 1.00E-01 NA 788F-09 Acetone 2.00E-01 NA 2.19E-08 Toluene 438E-09 **Semivolatile Organics** 8.77E-07 1.75E-08 2.00E-02 NA 2,4-Dimethylphenol 2.00E-03 NA 8.61E-05 2,4-Dinitrotoluene 1.72E-07 7.14E-10 9.78E-10  $NA$ 7.30E-01 Benzo(a)anthracene 8.57E-09 730E+00 1.17E-09 NA Benzo(a)pyrene<br>Benzo(b)fluoranthene 1.23E-09 7 30E-01 1.68E-09 **NA**  $NA$ NA Benzo(g,h,i)perylene 9.43E-10 1.29E-09 NA 7.30E-01 Benzo(k)fluoranthene  $137E-10$ 1.88E-09 NA 7.30E-02 Chrysene 9.59E-07 3.84E-08 4.00E-02 **NA** Fluoranthene 7.30E-01 6.86E-10 939E-10 Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene **NA**  $NA$  $NA$ Phenanthrene 3.00E-02 NA 8.58E-07 2.58E-08 Pyrene  $4.22E-11$ 3.01E-09 2.00E-02 1.40E-02 2.11E-06 4.22E-08 bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate Pesticides 6.07E-11 3.54E-09 2.53E-10 5.00E-04 2.40E-01 7.08E-06  $4,4'-DDD$  $_{\rm NA}$ NA  $4.4 - DDE$  $6.52E-11$ 5.37E-06 2.68E-09 1.92E-10 5 00E-04 3.40E-01  $4,4$ -DDT 3.57E-05 2.04E-09  $1.60E + 01$ 5.00E-05 Dieldrin 1.78E-09 1.27E-10  $6.00E - 03$ 1.30E-07 NA Endosulfan I 7.82E-10 **NA**  $NA$ Endosulfan II Metals NA NA Aluminum 4.00E-04 NA 7.53E-03 3.01E-06 Antimony  $1.11E-02$ 4.17E-07 1.75E+00 3.34E-06 2.39E-07 3.00E-04 Arsenic  $1.03E-03$ 7.00E-02 NA Barium 7.21E-05 2.99E-08 5.00E-03 4.30E+00 8.37E-05 1.29E-07 Beryllium 4.19F-07 5.00E-04  $NA$ 2.63E-03 1.32E-06 Cadmium NA **NA** Calcium 2.70E-03 1.35E-05 5 00E-03 **NA** Chromium NA **NA** Cobalt 4.00E-02 NA 1.83E-03 7.31E-05 Copper NA  $_{\rm NA}$ Iron NA  $_{\rm NA}$ Lead **NA NA** Magnesium 5.83E-02 5.00E-03 NA  $2.92F - 04$ Manganese 3.00E-04  $NA$ 1.48E-04 Mercury 4.44E-08 1.73E-05 2.00E-02  $NA$ 8.66E-04 Nickel NA<br>5.00E-03 NA Potassium 1.39E-04 NA Selenium 6.94E-07 **NA** NA Sodium 6.45E-03 7.00E-05 NA 4.51E-07 Thallium 233E-03 1.63E-05 7.00E-03 **NA** Vanadium 3.44E-04 **NA** 1.03E-04 3.00E-01 Zinc 5.61E-07 9.57E-02 Totals - HQ & CR

> Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.





# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

r



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

Page 1 of 2

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:/eng/senecals1617n/idsk/human/17/risktabl/soirk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXUMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



h leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktab\\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Variables:

Assumptions:

 $CS$  = Chemical Concentration in Soil (mg soil/kg)<br>CF = Conversion Factor (10-6 kg/mg) SA = Surface Area Contact (cm<sup>3</sup>)<br>AF =Soil to Skin Adherence Factor (mg/cm<sup>3</sup>)<br>ABS = Absorption Factor (unitless)

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Compound Specific PCBs and Cd (EPA, 1992b) 1.0 (RME all receptors) EPC Soil Data - RME 2,300 (RME Child)  $10-6$ 

(Default Assumption 0% = 0.0)

5 (RME)<br>25 kg (child)<br>5 x 365 (Nc), 70 x 365 (Car) Assumptions: 50 (RME) EF = Exposure Frequency (events/year)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)<br>BW = Bodyweight (kg)  $AT = Averageing Time (days)$ Variables:

h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\idsk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 3 of 2

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



 $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ 

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.
## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/19/97

 $\tilde{\alpha}$ 



## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:leng\seneca\s1617fi\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

## **TABLE 7-24**

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIVA EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

i.

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\isk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2



## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



- ngisenecais 1617 riviskihumani 17 visktablisorik 17 r. wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97



11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 3 of 2

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da





11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\bar{t}$ 



h:/eng/seneca/s1617ri/risk/human/17/risktabl/subrk17r.wk4

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:/eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

id.

Page 3 of 2

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**



## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Child

## **TABLE 7-67**

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>1</sub>

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** Child Child



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 1<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\swrk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 1

Compound Specific, EPA, 1992

Compound Specific, EPA, 1992

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE1**

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose

Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sence Army Depot Activity



Page 1 of 1

horing here and 1617 rivisk thuman to 7 visktablis wrkt 7r. wk4

## CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE1**

## **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor






# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-63**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>
FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>
CASE 2<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Act



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity





# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Senega Army Depot Activity



h:leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-30**

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Absorbed Dose (mg/kg-day) = CS x CF x SA x AF x ABS x EF x ED  $BW xAT$ 

Variables:

Assumptions:

CS = Chemical Concentration in Soil (mg soil/kg) AF=Soil to Skin Adherence Factor (mg/cm<sup>2</sup>)  $CF = Conversion Factor (10-6 kg/mg)$  $ABS = Absorption Factor (unildess)$ SA = Surface Area Contact (cm<sup>3</sup>)

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Compound Specific PCBs and Cd (EPA, 1992b)<br>(Default Assumption 0% = 0.0) 1.0 (RME all receptors) EPC Soil Data - RME 2,300 (RME Child)  $10-6$ 

5 x 365 (Nc), 70 x 365 (Car) Assumptions: 25 kg (child) 50 (RME)  $5(RME)$ EF = Exposure Frequency (events/year)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)  $AT = Average Time (days)$  $\mathbf{BW}=\mathbf{Bodyweight}\left(kg\right)$ Variables:

h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Page 1 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h<sup>32</sup> ~ hisenecals1617rilrisk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

11/19/97

i.

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Senca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Page 3 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity





# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sence Army Depot Activity



htorg\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

þ

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

11/19/97

 $\tilde{t}$ 

### **TABLE 7-24**

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Senesa Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation **Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97

11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-18**

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 2<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\ang\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 3 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



×

Cancer

**Risk** 

1.08E-06

1.79E-06

1.16E-04

7.25E-05

4.70E-05

2.73E-03

1.61E-04

3.52E-03

1.50E-02

### **TABLE 7-51**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

### **Hazard RfD** Oral **CDI**  $CDI$ Quotient **Slope Factor**  $(Car)$  $(Nc)$ Analyte  $(mg/kg-day)-1$ (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) 5.78E-03 1.75E+00 3,00E-04 6.20E-07 1.73E-06 5.60E-04 NA 7.00E-02 3.92E-05 1.29E-03 5.00E-04 NA 6.45E-07 4.88E-04 **NA** 4.00E-02 1.95E-05 NA NA

3.00E-04

5.00E-03

5.00E-03

7.00E-05

3.00E-01

5.00E-04

NA

**NA** 

NA

**NA** 

NA

NA

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

3.48E-08

3.63E-07

2.35E-07

1.91E-07

4.82E-05

1.76E-06

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

**METALS** 

Arsenic

Barium

Copper

Mercury

Selenium

Thallium

**HERBICIDES** 

Totals - HQ & CR

Lead

Silver

Zinc

**MCPA** 

Cadmium

11/19/97

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4



### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



hangisenecais1617ninskihumani17insktablisoirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneea Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617r\insk\human\17\nsktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97

.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $\epsilon$ 

### **TABLE 7-53**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Activity



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da







### CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### **CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)** FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.
### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\17\risktabl\airrik17r.wk4

à.

### TABLE 7-7A

### ${\begin{array}{c} \textbf{AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTATIONS}\\ \textbf{REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)}\\ \textbf{CASE 2} \end{array}}$ **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



L

### TABLE 7-7A

### AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

Seneca Army Depot Activity



25 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

 $BW = Bodyweight (kg)$ <br>AT = Averaging Time (days)

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

11/19/97

### CASE 2 CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CASE 2 CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### 11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-12**

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE<sub>2</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity





 $\bar{\sigma}$ 

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 2

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Variables:

CA = Chemical Concentration in Air (mg/m<sup>3</sup>)  $IR = Inhalation Rate (m<sup>3</sup>/day)$  $EF = Exposure Frequency (days/yr)$  $ED = Exposure\;Duration\; (years)$  $BW = Bodyweight (kg)$  $AT = Averaging Time (days)$ 

**Assumptions:** 

**Calculated EPC Air Data - RME** 20 (all receptors) **250 (RME Construction Workers)** 1 (Upper bound period of Construction Worker) 70 (Adult Male) 1 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $\hat{\bullet}$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $\overline{AT} = \overline{Average Time (days)}$ <br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



ι

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 2 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

### **Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinoger<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.





### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 CASE 2<br>Senect Army Deput Activition



25,550<br>25,550

 $Car$ 

និន្ទីនិន្ទីនិន្ទីនិន្ទីនិន្ទីនិ<br>វ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ាវ៉ា

ងងងង

nnnn

3333

 $2222$ 

ន្តន្តន្តន្តន្ត<br>ងួងដឹងដឹង

**222222** 

**ភ**ភ្នាន់ អ

nnnnn

**ភភភភ**ភ

222222

888888<br><u>EBBBBBB</u><br>EDBBBBB

445-03<br>445-03<br>445-03<br>445-03<br>505-03<br>505-03

4,4-DDD<br>4,4-DDE<br>4,4-DDT<br>Dieldin<br>Dieldin I<br>Endosulfan II<br>Endosulfan II

Pesticides

h:leng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabNsedrk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>CASE 2



 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabl\sedrk17r.wk4

 $\tilde{t}$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 2<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Dep



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carci<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/19/97

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INCESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSFASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



ally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data. Note: Cells in this table were into

11/19/97

11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-71**

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS **COLATION OF INDICARCINODENT AND CARCINODENT (While Wading)**<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>2</sub> **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

Child Child CDI **RfD** Oral Hazard Cancer  $CDI$ Risk  $(Car)$ **Slope Factor Ouotient**  $(Nc)$ Analyte (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day)-1 (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) **Volatile Organics** 788F-08 1.00E-01 **NA** 7.88E-09 Acetone 2.19E-08 4.38E-09 2.00E-01 **NA** Toluene Semivolatile Organics 8.77E-07 1.75E-08 2.00E-02 NA 2,4-Dimethylphenol 8.61E-05 1.72E-07 2.00E-03 **NA** 2.4-Dinitrotoluene 7.30E-01 7.14E-10 9.78F-10 Benzo(a)anthracene **NA**  $NA$ 7.30E+00 8.57E-09 117F-09 Benzo(a)pyrene 1.23E-09 7.30E-01 1.68E-09 NA Benzo(b)fluoranthene NA NA Benzo(g,h,i)perylene 7.30F-01 9.43E-10 1.29E-09 NA Benzo(k)fluoranthene 7.30E-02 1.37E-10 1.88E-09 NA Chrysene 9.59E-07 4.00E-02 NA Fluoranthene 3.84E-08  $_{\rm NA}$ 7.30E-01 6.86F-10 9.39E-10 Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene NA  $_{\rm NA}$ Phenanthrene 8.58E-07 2.58E-08 3.00E-02 **NA** Pyrene<br>bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate 2.11E-06 4.22E-11 1.40E-02 3.01E-09 200E-02 4.22E-08 Pesticides 7.08E-06 6.07E-11 2.40E-01 5.00E-04  $4.4'$ -DDD 3.54E-09 2.53E-10 **NA NA**  $4,4'$ -DDE 6.52F-11 5.00E-04 3.40E-01 5.37E-06 1.92E-10 2.68E-09  $4,4'$ -DDT 2.04E-09 3 57F-05 1.78E-09  $1.27E-10$ 5.00E-05 1.60E+01 Dieldrin 1.30E-07 7.82E-10 6.00E-03 **NA** Endosulfan I **NA** NA **Endosulfan II** Metals  $_{\rm NA}$ NA Aluminum 7.53E-03 4 00F-04 **NA** 3.01E-06 Antimony 3.00E-04 1.75E+00 1.11E-02 4.17E-07 3,34E-06 239E-07 Arsenic 7.00E-02 NA 1.03E-03 Barium 721F-05 1.29E-07 2.99E-08 5.00E-03 4.30E+00 837F-05 4.19E-07 Beryllium 2.63E-03 1.32E-06 5.00E-04 **NA**  $C$ admium **NA NA** Calcium 2.70E-03 5.00E-03 NA Chromium 1.35E-05 NA NÄ Cobalt 1.83E-03 4.00E-02 **NA** 7.31E-05 Copper **NA NA** Iron NA **NA** Lead NA  $NA$ Magnesium 5 83F-02 5.00E-03 NA 2.92E-04 Manganese 3.00E-04 **NA** 1.48E-04 4.44E-08 Mercury 8.66E-04 **NA** 1.73E-05 2.00E-02 Nickel NA NA Potassium 5.00E-03 NA 1.39E-04 6.94E-07 Selenium  $NA$ NA Sodium 6.45E-03 4.51E-07 7.00E-05 NA Thallium  $NA$ 2.33E-03 1.63E-05 7.00E-03 Vanadium 3.44E-04 3.00E-01 NA Zinc 1.03E-04 5.61E-07 9.57E-02 Totals - HQ & CR

> Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose **Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor**

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data





## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 2<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 2<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:/eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 2<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>2</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>2</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

11/19/97

**TABLE 7-28** 

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RMI)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



hilling/senecals1617rivisk/human/17visktabl/subrk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sence Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

11/19/97

# **CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL**<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Senea Army Depot Activiy



h'leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

×

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>2</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>2</sub>

### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.




11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-34**

## CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation CASE<sub>2</sub>

Seneca Army Depot Activity

25,550  $\mathsf{Car}$ Averaging<br>Time  $(days)$ Child (Nc) **<u>g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g</u>** ,825 Child<br>Body<br>Weight<br>(&) 88888888888888888  $25$ Assumptions: 2.10E+01  $\begin{array}{c}\n\textbf{Tau} \\
\textbf{hours}\n\end{array}$ 2222222222222222  $\mathbf{B}$ <br>(unitless) 1.30E+01 \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ EF = Exposure Frequency (days/year)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)<br>CF = Vol. Conv. Factor (1 L/1000 cm<sup>.</sup>)<br>B = Bunge Model Value  $(1$  liter/1000 cm<sup>3</sup>) Conv. Factor Volumetric 888888<br>**BBBBBBB**<br>BBBBBBB 1.0E-03 1.0E-03 1.0E-03 1.0E-03 1.0E-03 1.0E-03 **Exposure**<br>Duration Child  $(sens)$ s **<u><u><u></u>**</u></u> Frequency Exposure Variables: (days/year) 88888888888888888 25 Exposure (hours/day) Time ÿ. Kp<br>Permeability Coefficient Calculated from EPA, 1992 10543<br>10543<br>10543<br>1054  $\begin{array}{r} 1.656 \\ 1.676 \\ 1.767 \\ 1.876 \\ 1.976 \\ 1.$ 3.3E-02 1.0E-04  $\frac{1}{2}$ 1.0E-03 1.0E-03 Skin Surface Area Contact Assumptions: Child  $\text{cm}^2$ 2,170 Absorbed Dose (mg/kg-day) = DA x SA x Kp x ET x EF x ED x CF EPC<br>Surface W. 7.82E-04<br>6.32E+01<br>6.31E-04<br>1.93E-02 3.23E-03<br>7.03E+00<br>9.00E-04<br>3.63E-02 .71E-02 8.90E+00 3.52E+00  $(\mathrm{mgL})$ 2.00E-03  $.22E-02$ 10-3E-01 1.20E-02 1.03E-03 2.21E-02 4.26E-03 **BW** x AT Dose/Event (mg-cm<sup>2</sup>-event) 7.82E-07<br>6.32E-02<br>1.26E-06 Absorbed 4.26E-06 7.22E-05 1.93E-04 1.48E-07 8.90E-03 1.20E-05<br>1.03E-07 3.52E-03 3.23E-06<br>7.03E-03<br>9.00E-07<br>2.18E-05 DA = Absorbed Dose per Event (mg-cm<sup>2</sup>/event) 8.36E-04 21E-05 Absorbed<br>Dose (Car) 1.81E-12  $(mg/kg$ -day) 1.17E-08 Child Child<br>Absorbed<br>Dose (Nc)<br>(mg/kg-day) 131E-10<br>254E-11<br>4.29E-12<br>4.65E-12 7.12E-11<br>6.14E-14 5.35E-12<br>7.76E-11 1.92E-11 1.64E-07 1.50E-11 Variables: SEMIVOLATILE ORGANICS bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate EQUATION: Analyte Lead<br>Magnesium Manganese<br>Nickel Calcium<br>Chromium Potassium<br>Selenium **METALS** Cadmium /anadium Antimony Arsenic Sodium Barium opper inc no.

 $Kp = Permeability Coefficient (cm/hour)$ <br> $\overline{ET} = Exposter Time (hourslasy)$ <br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Compound Specific, EPA, 1992

25 (Child)

Compound Specific, EPA, 1992<br>1 (RME) Compound Specific, EPA, 1992

2,170 (RME Child)

SA = Surface Area Contact (cm<sup>3</sup>)

5 (RME)

0.001

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>2</sub>

#### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sence Army Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\swrk17r.wk4

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)**

CASE<sub>2</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation** Depot Activity



Totals - HQ & CR

Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor









17 all soils case 3



Page 2

17 surface soils case 3

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



Page1

17 surface soils case 3



<sup>2</sup> abu





## CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



 $\bar{\bar{z}}$ 

#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE (ONSITE)<br>FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

11/19/97

#### TABLE 7-7A

#### AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



#### TABLE 7-7A

#### AMBIENT AIR EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **CASE 3**<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\17\risktabl\airrik17r.wk4

11/19/97

Page 2 of 2

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

#### **Seneca Army Depot Activity**



#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**

#### Cancer Hazard **Carc. Slope CDI** CDI RfC Analyte **Inhalation** Quotient Risk  $(Nc)$  $(Car)$  $(mg/kg-day)-1$ (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) (mg/kg-day) **METALS** 1.76E-08 1.51E+01 1.17E-09  $_{\rm NA}$ Arsenic 5.23E-04 1.43E-04 NA 7.47E-08 Barium 6.30E+00 2.73E-09 4.34E-10  $_{\rm NA}$ Cadmium **NA** NA Copper **NA** NA Lead 8.12E-07 8.57E-05 NA 6.96E-11 Mercury NA  $_{\rm NA}$ Selenium NA NA Silver NA NA Thallium NA NA Zinc **HERBICIDES NA** NA **MCPA**  $2.04E-08$ 5.24E-04 Total HQ & CR Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic) / Reference Concentration

Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) **REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE 3

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Variables:

CA = Chemical Concentration in Air (mg/m<sup>3</sup>) IR = Inhalation Rate (m<sup>3</sup>/day) EF = Exposure Frequency (days/yr)  $ED = Exposure\;Duration\; (years)$ <br> $BW = Bodyweight\; (kg)$  $AT = Averaging Time (days)$ 

**BW x AT** 

**Assumptions:** 

**Calculated EPC Air Data - RME** 20 (all receptors) 250 (RME Construction Workers) 1 (Upper bound period of Construction Worker) 70 (Adult Male) 1 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $\tilde{\omega}$ 

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

#### **Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Cancinogenic) x Inhalation Slope Factor

#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



#### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $IR = Inhalation Rate (m<sup>3</sup>/day)$  $EF = Exposure Frequency (days/yr)$  $ED = Exposure\;Duration\; (years)$  $BW = Bodyweight (kg)$  $\overline{AT} = \overline{Averageing Time (days)}$  Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data. 20 (all receptors) 250 (RME Industrial Workers) 5 70 (Adult Male) 5 x 365 (Nc) 70 x 365 (Car)

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

#### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INHALATION OF DUST IN AMBIENT AIR<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

#### **Seneca Army Depot Activity**







11/19/97

 $\bar{\rm s}$ 

**TABLE 7-38** 

 $\overline{()}$ 

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investgation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabNsedrk17r.wk4

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca A-tmy Depot Activity



Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Page 2 of 2

h:leng/senecals1617 human/17/risktabl/sedrk17r.wk4

11/19/97

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$
$\lambda$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Dep



## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>REASONABLE NAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE NAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

E



11/19/97

Page 1 of 2

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3





h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabNsedrk17r.wk4

11/19/97

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SEDIMENT (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Activity







# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



hardysenecals1617riviskVhuman\17visktabl\subrk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\subrk17r.wk4

Page 3 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE<sub>3</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Page 1 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>3</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



11/19/97

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL<br>CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



hang/senecals1617rilrisk/human/17lrisktabl/subrk17r.wk4

ā

Page 3 of 2

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE & SUBSURFACE SOIL **CONSTRUCTION WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>3</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor **Hazard Quotient** 





### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)** REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation** 

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>CASE 3

SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



 $Kp = Permeability Coefficient (embour)$ <br>  $ET = Exposure Time (hour 5day)$ <br>
Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Compound Specific, EPA, 1992

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

Page 1 of 1

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SURFACE WATER (while Wading) **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>3</sub>

**SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose

Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

# CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER (while Wading)<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)

CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SURFACE WATER **FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)** CASE<sub>3</sub>

### **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor





11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



Page 1 of 2

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



h<sup>-1</sup>eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

is.

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity

**TABLE 7-63** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da



### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



ä

11/19/97



### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



F alsenecals1617ninskihumani17inskiabisork17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2



### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity CASE<sub>3</sub>



Absorbed Dose (mg/kg-day) = CS x CF x SA x AF x ABS x EF x ED  $BW \times AT$ 

Variables:

CS = Chemical Concentration in Soil (mg soil/kg) AF =Soil to Skin Adherence Factor (mg/cm<sup>2</sup>)  $CF = \text{Conversion Factor} (10-6 \text{ kg/mg})$ ABS = Absorption Factor (unitless) SA = Surface Area Contact (cm<sup>2</sup>)

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

Compound Specific PCBs and Cd (EPA, 1992b) (Default Assumption 0% = 0.0) 1.0 (RME all receptors) EPC Soil Data - RME 2,300 (RME Child) Assumptions:  $10-6$ 

25 kg (child)<br>5 x 365 (Nc), 70 x 365 (Car) Assumptions: 50 (RME)  $5$  (RME) EF = Exposure Frequency (events/year)<br>ED = Exposure Duration (years)<br>BW = Bodyweight (kg)<br>AT = Averaging Time (days)

Variables:

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **EXAMPLE MAXIMUM SAN SEAD-17**<br>
CASE 3<br>
SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>
Seneca Army Depot Activity





 $\hat{\mathbf{e}}$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL FUTURE TRESSPASSER (Child)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\^~nq\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 1 of 2
### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

11/19/97

ė

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



htinglaenecals1617rilriskhumanl17lrisktabllsoirk17r.wk4

Page 3 of 2

11/19/97

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM THE INGESTION OF ONSITE SOILS SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

11/19/97

# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSIRE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Senca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4



# CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Senesa Army Depot Activity



h:\enq\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

Page 2 of 2

11/19/97

11/19/97

### **TABLE 7-24**

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



ABS = Absorption Factor (unitless)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

 $\bar{8}$ 

h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO SOIL SITE WORKER EXPOSURE (CURRENT LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.

## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



## CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Sencea Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF INTAKE FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMIUM EXPOSURE (RME) SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



Page 3 of 2

h:leng\seneca\s1617ri\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF NORTHE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM INGESTION OF ONSITE SOIL INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**

**Seneca Army Depot Activity** 



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor

Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.



### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



h:\eng\seneca\s1617n\risk\human\17\risktabl\soirk17r.wk4



CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Invesigation

**TABLE 7-26** 

11/19/97

Page 2 of 2

### CALCULATION OF ABSORBED DOSE FROM DERNAL CONTACT TO SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE)<br>REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME)<br>SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



AF=Soil to Skin Adherence Factor (mg/cm<sup>3</sup>)<br>ABS = Absorption Factor (unitless)<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity data.<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank

11/19/97

 $\overline{1}$ 

### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS<br>FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL<br>INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation**<br>Seneca Army Depot Activity



### CALCULATION OF NONCARCINOGENIC AND CARCINOGENIC RISKS FROM DERMAL CONTACT TO ONSITE SOIL INDUSTRIAL WORKER EXPOSURE (FUTURE LAND USE) REASONABLE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE (RME) CASE 3 **SEAD-17 Remedial Investigation Seneca Army Depot Activity**



Hazard Quotient = Chronic Daily Intake (Noncarcinogenic)/ Reference Dose<br>Cancer Risk = Chronic Daily Intake (Carcinogenic) x Slope Factor<br>Note: Cells in this table were intentionally left blank due to a lack of toxicity da







S.

ç

### **APPENDIX C**

**COST ESTIMATES** 







### Seneca Army Depot SEAD 16 & 17 RIFS **Cost Estimates Table of Contents**

Summary scope of work including assumptions made **Section 1** 

**Section 2 Tables** 

> Table no. 1 - Alternative 1: Excavate/ Off-site Disposal **Cost Estimate Summary** Table no. 2 - Alternative 2: Excavate/Stabilize/On-site Disposal **Cost Estimate Summary** Table no. 3 - Alternative 3: Excavate/Soil Washing/ Off-site Disposal **Cost Estimate Summary**

**Section 3 Detailed Cost Estimate** 

**ECHOS Detailed Cost Estimate** 

**Section 4 Figures** 

Figure 1 On-site monofill details and quantity take offs

Figure 2 Preliminary remediation system layout/site plan

Figure 3 SEAD 16 estimated soil over 2000 ppm lead

Figure 4 SEAD 17 estimated soil over 2000 ppm lead

Figure 5 SEAD 16 estimated total volume of soil/sediment to be excavated

Figure 6 SEAD 17 estimated total volume of soil/sediment to be excavated

Figure 7 Soil washing-estimated volume reduction calculation

**Section 5 Quotations** 

- Earthwatch quote dated November 12,1997  $\bullet$ for disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous soils
- Seneca Meadows Landfill telephone memorandum dated November  $\bullet$ 10,1997 for the disposal of non-hazardous soils

**Section 6 Comparative Cost-Estimate** 

Alternative 1: Excavate/Stabilize/Off-site Disposal



section 1 Summary scope of work including assumptions made Pg 1-4

DOC2.DOC



### **Seneca Army Depot SEAD 16 & 17 RIFS** Cost estimates

### **Introduction**

The cost for the following remediation alternatives (4,5 and 6) have been developed:

- excavate / off-site disposal
- excavate/stabilize-solidify/on-site disposal
- excavate/soil washing/ off site disposal

The cost estimate was developed based on the scope of work as outlined below. The costs were based on quantity take off from the attached drawings and unit prices taken from the ECHOS estimating library. Some of the more important unit prices, such as landfill disposal costs, were updated with vendor quotation. These vendor quotes are attached to the detailed estimate for reference. The costs developed in the ECHOS detailed summary include the WBS numbers for each line item. Note that the WBS numbering system that is used by ECHOS is a different than the numbering system used in MCACES and the DOE HTRW RAW BS. ECHOS summarizes cost by task and the task is not assigned a WBS number. Summary tables have been provided that follow the WBS numbering system from MCACES. The cost developed by ECHOS for each task was assigned to the appropriate WBS number in the summary tables.

### **General Assumed Scope**

In all three of the alternatives the first task is screening by a UXB team for unexploded ordinances. The site will then be surveyed to lay out the areas to be excavated and then the soils and sediments will be excavated. The screened soils will be placed into piles for sampling while the material removed during the screening process will be disposed of off-site. The material removed during the screening operation may include shell casing, bullets, rocks, and roots.

The second task is a sampling and analysis event. Both the piles and the excavations will be sampled. Each soil pile will be 150 cubic yards. One composite soil sample will be taken from each soil pile and analyzed to determine whether it is classified as a characteristic hazardous waste. It is estimated that about 2000 yards of material will be excavated, which will constitute about 13 piles that will need to be sampled. At the same time that the piles are sampled, the excavations will be sampled. The excavations will be analyzed to confirm that the remediation goals have been reached. In this case the remediation goals are to remove soils that have total lead levels above 500 ppm, and

sediments that have lead levels greater than 31 ppm. Therefore these confimatory samples will be analyzed for the TAL metals and the lead levels from the analysis will be compared to the targets. If the lead level in a sample is above the targets then additional soils/sediments in that area will be excavated and another confirmatory sample taken. The estimated number of the confirmatory samples is based on the following criteria. It is assumed for the cost estimate that two samples will be taken from each trench, one at each end, and five soil samples will be taken from SEAD 16, and five soil samples will be taken from SEAD 17. In addition the sampling event will include a trip blank and a duplicate.

For alternative 6 (soil washing) only the excavation will be sampled during this first sampling event because all the soil will be washed and replaced in piles. Once all the washing is done there will be another sampling event to demonstrate that a large fraction of soils can be backfilled (non hazardous and lead less than the clean up standard) and the fines will be analyzed (characteristic hazardous waste) to determine if the fines, which will be disposed of off-site, need to be transported as a non-hazardous or hazardous waste. Also in alternative 5 the stabilized material will also have to be tested to demonstrate that the stabilized material is not a characteristic hazardous waste. The estimate allows one TCLP RCRA sample per 150 cubic yards of stabilized material.

### **Detailed Scope**

The first alternative in the cost estimate corresponds to alternative 4 as described in section 3.0 and 5.0 of the FS. It includes excavating the soils and sediments and placing them into piles. The piles will be sampled and the samples will be tested to determine whether they have TCLP levels that are below the regulatory limits for a characteristic hazardous waste. If the pile samples are not classified as hazardous then the pile will be disposed of off-site at a Subtitle D landfill. Piles of soils/sediments that had samples with TCLP levels over the regulatory limit for a characteristic hazardous waste will be transported as a hazardous waste to a facility off-site where the soils/sediments will be stabilized and disposed in a Subtitle d landfill.

The second alternative in the cost estimate corresponds to alternative 5 as described in section 3.0 and 5.0 of the FS. In this alternative the soils and sediments would be excavated and placed in piles and the piles would be sampled the same as in the first alternative. In this alternative all the soils and sediments would be disposed on-site in a new on-site landfill instead of off-site at an existing landfill. The new on-site landfill would have to meet the requirements of the New York State regulations for an industrial waste monofill per 6 NYCRR 360-2.14. These requirements include both construction requirements as well as O&M requirements. The construction requirements include the following features which have been included in the estimate:

A bottom composite liner system with a two foot clay layer and a 60 mil HDPE liner

A leachate collection layer with two feet of sand and 4 in. PVC collection pipes spaced at 20 ft.

A filter layer consisting of a filter fabric to keep the leachate collection layer clean

A top containment liner system consisting of a 6 in sand layer with a 60 mil  $\bullet$ HDPE liner with a two foot layer of soil on top of the membrane and 6 inches of topsoil.

Soils that are classified as non-hazardous would be placed directly into the new on-site landfill while soils that are classified as hazardous waste will be solidified on-site before being placed in the new on-site landfill. The solidification process used in this estimate consists of a batch treatment process. The soils are loaded into a batch mixer along with cement (other mixtures may be used depending on pilot testing that will be done later.) The mixture is dumped into a wooden one cubic yard box and the mixture is allowed to solidify like concrete. The wooden box is then removed and the solidified block is then disposed off-site at the new on-site industrial waste monofill.

The third alternative corresponds to alternative 6 as described inspection 3.0 and 5.0 of the FS. It includes soil washing as a way of reducing the volume of soils that will require stabilization-solidification and disposal. In this alternative the soils and sediments will be excavated, screened and placed into one pile. The pile will not be sampled, instead all the soils will be washed and physically separated. One fraction will consist of the silt and clay portion of the soils while a second fraction would consist of the sand and gravel portion of the soils. The silt and clay portion (the smaller fraction) of the soils will contain the majority of the lead. All the washed material will be placed into 150 cubic yard piles which will be sampled. These samples will be analyzed to determine whether the soil is a characteristic hazardous waste and the samples will be analyzed for TAL metals. Those piles containing soil that is classified as hazardous waste will be disposed off-site at a facility that will stabilize the soils and then place them in a Subtitle D landfill. Those piles that are not classified as hazardous waste but have total lead levels over 500 ppm will be disposed off-site as non-hazardous waste at a Subtitle D landfill. Those piles classified as non-hazardous but containing lead levels over 31 ppm will also be disposed off-site at a Subtitle D landfill. Those piles with soil that is not classified as a characteristic hazardous waste and have total lead levels below 500 will be backfilled into the areas excavated.

### **Assumptions**

The following assumptions were used in developing the cost estimates:

1. The amount of soil/sediments that will require stabilization/solidification in alternative 1 and 2 was calculated based on the estimated volume of soils and sediments that have total lead concentrations higher than 2000 ppm. Based on past experience at this site it is

expected that soils with total lead levels less than 2000 ppm will have TCLP lead levels below the regulatory limit (5 ppm) set for a characteristic hazardous waste.

2. The on-site landfill requires a 5 foot clearance between the groundwater and the bottom layer of the landfill. Since the groundwater in the excavated areas is only 5 to 10 feet deep it is assumed that a suitable location can be found on-site that meets the requirements for an industrial waste monofill.

3. It is assumed that the lead contamination is contained in the silt/clay fraction of the soils. It is also assumed that the silt/clay fraction will be classified as a characteristic hazardous waste and that the sand/gravel fraction will be clean enough to be used as backfill. Volumes of washed soils that need to be stabilized and solidified are estimated based on the available grain size analysis from the site. Based on this data it is estimated that the silt/clay fraction of the soil represents about one third of the total volume of the soil/sediments.

4. The volumes of soil and sediments are based on the contoured areas shown on figures 3, 4, 5 and 6 which attempt to delineate areas by lead concentration. Soil volumes were estimated by measuring the areas with a planimeter and then multiplying by the soil depth. The sediment volumes were estimated by multiplying the length of the trench by the width (assumed to be 3 feet) by the depth of the sediment (assumed to be 3 feet). The remediation project will include a confirmatory sampling plan to analyze samples at the edge of the excavation to assure that the clean up standard is met. If the lead levels in the confirmatory samples do not meet the clean up standard then additional soils will be excavated and treated.

5. It is assumed that the existing railroad tracks next to the building at SEAD 16 will not be removed. During the RI, the samples in this area were taken from the drainage swales around the track, but no samples were taken from the ballast around the train tracks. Based on this it is assumed that the remediation around the train tracks will involve excavating soils from the drainage swales only.

6. The building at SEAD 16 is inactive. It is assumed that this building will be cleaned of any materials that contribute to elevated lead levels in the indoor air. The building will not be demolished as part of this remediation. Soils and debris will be removed from the building and the building will receive a good cleaning only. Soils from the building will be placed in piles similar to the soils and sediments and will be handled in the same manner. It is estimated that the building has about 100 cubic yards of soil in it.

7. O & M costs only include the sampling and analysis of monitoring wells. The estimate assumes that 4 wells will be monitored on a quarterly basis at SEAD 16 & 17
and that 4 monitoring wells will be monitored at the new on-site industrial waste monofill.

8. The cost for UXB clearance is not included in the estimate. However allowances have been made for the excavation of the soils and sediments which will probably be done by the UXB team. The UXB team will also be responsible for screening the soils for the removal of unexploded ordanances, the cost for the screening has not been included in the estimate nor has the cost for disposal of the screened material.

### Contingency

A large contingency should be used on this project since the volumes of sediment and soil that will require excavation could increase significantly if the confirmatory samples have lead levels over the remediation goals of 500 ppm for soil and 31 ppm for sediment.

Paul Messelaar PE.



## section 2 Tables



 $\sim$  100  $\mu$ 

 $\alpha$ 

 $\lambda_1^+$ 

## DOC3.DOC

### SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD 16 & 17 RIFS **COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY** ALTERNATIVE NO 1 EXCAVATE/OFF-SITE DISPOSAL



### **SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD 16 & 17 RIFS COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY** ALTERNATIVE NO 2 EXCAVATE/STABILIZE/ON-SITE DISPOSAL

### **WBS** number description cost  $32xxx$ design and treatability study \$86,118 (estimated at 15% of construction cost) 331xx01 mobilization and preparatory work \$15,787 (includes decontamination facilities and fencing) 331xx02 monitoring, sampling, testing, and analysis \$64,968 (includes soil sampling analysis) 331xx03 site work \$8,208 (includes access roads, cleanup and landscaping, clear and grub) 331xx06 groundwater collection and control \$25,408 (includes groundwater monitoring wells) 331xx08 solids collection and containment \$166,440 (Excavation, buried waste and capping) 331xx15 stabilization/fixation/encapsulation \$199,385 (includes solidification/stabilization) 331xx22 general requirements \$48,800 (includes contractor costs/ General Conditions) engineering during construction 332xx \$25,128 (includes professional Labor) 333xx construction management \$20,000 SUBTOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST \$660,242 \$561,206 location multiplier 0.85 escalation 10% \$56,120 overhead and profit 13% \$72,956 \$112.241 contingencies 20% TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST \$802,523 \$20,422 per

Present worth based on 30 years and  $i = 5\%$ 

(includes o&m costs)

operation and maintenance (post construction)

sampling

\$1,116,409

event

342XXX

### SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD 16 & 17 RIFS **COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY** ALTERNATIVE NO 3 EXCAVATE/SOIL WASHING/OFF-SITE DISPOSAL









section 3 Detailed cost estimate

ECHOES detailed cost estimate Pg 1-32

DOC8.DOC





# parsons engineering science

Boston , Massachusetts , 02199 Prudential Center

617 262 3200

\$1,963.83

Ĭ



Softbooks -- Site Summ

 $\overline{ }$ 

**RA-5** 



\$48,800.24<br>\$5,621.80

\$10,166.04<br>\$25,408.13

\$48,911.12

\$25,128.85 \$199,385.92

\$5,064.00<br>\$64,968.36<br>\$117,529.66<br>\$1,487.10<br>\$1,657.59

# RA-6





0 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9

Softbooks -- Site Summ

 $\sim$ Page







# parsons engineering science

Prudential Center Boston , Massachusetts , 02199<br>617 262 3200



Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm



Softbooks - Detail by Treatm



 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm



softbooks -- Detail by Creatm

)<br>J)



Softbooks - Detail by Treatm

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



ä

Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm

C



Softbooks -- Detail by Creatm

ÿ.



Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm



Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm







Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm

C



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm



 $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$ 







parsons engineering science

Prudential Center

Roston , Massachusetts , 02199

617 262 3200

Paul Messelaar

11/2/97

Soil and sediment remediation at two small arms munitions<br>deactivation furnaces, one active and one inactive. Remediation<br>alternatives includes; RA-1 no action; RA-4 excavate/off-site landfill;<br>RA-5 excavate/solidify/ on-s

 $C = 1 - 1$ 



Professional Labor



Softbooks -- Full Detail



11/16/97 3:09:27 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail


Page 3

11/16/97 3:09:28 PM





 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

Softbooks -- Full Detail

11/16/97 3:09:29 PM



 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

 $\lambda$ 









11/16/97 3:09:34 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail

C



Page 11

11/16/97 3:09:35 PM



11/16/97 3:09:35 PM

Softbooks -- 3ull Detail

C



.

11/16/97 3:09:36 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail



Total

**Materials** 

Equipment

Labor

Safety<br>Quantity/Unit Level

n A F



 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



 $\bar{\bar{z}}$ 

Softbooks -- Full Detail

11/16/97 3:09:39 PM



11/16/97 3:09:39 PM



11/16/97 3:09:40 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



11/16/97 3:09:41 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail



C

11/16/97 3:09:42 PM



11/16/97 3:09:43 PM



11/16/97 3:09:44 PM



 $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ 

Softbooks -- Full Detail

11/16/97 3:09:44 PM



Page 24

C.

11/16/97 3:09:45 PM



11/16/97 3:09:46 PM









11/16/97 3:09:49 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail





11/16/97 3:09:51 PM

Softbooks -- 3ull Detail



11/16/97 3:09:52 PM



 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 



 $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ 

 $\alpha$ 



11/16/97 3:09:54 PM

Softbooks -- 3ull Detail



The three data items in the labor and equipment columns are: unit cost, productivity,<br>and total cost. The two data items in the materials column are: unit cost and total cost.

Softbooks -- Full Detail

Page 36

11/16/97 3:09:55 PM




section 4 figures

Figure 1 On-site monofill details and Quanity take offs

Figure 2 Preliminary remediation system layout/site plan

Figure 3 SEAD 16 estimated soil over 2000 ppm lead

Figure 4 SEAD 17 estimated soil over 2000 ppm lead

Figure 5 SEAD 16 estimated total volume of soil/sediment to be excavated

Figure 6 SEAD 17 estimated total volume of soil/sediment to be excavated

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

Figure 7 Soil washing-estimated volume reduction calculation

DOC6.DOC



#### PARSONS MAIN, INC.



Volume of SOR to BE LANDFILLED = 2375 CY  $\varpi$ 

2 Assume / composite liver por 6 NYCRR 760-214

use depth in monofill = 10ft. 3



Figure No.1<br>Seneca Army Deput-SEMO 16717 RIFS<br>COST ESTIMATE BACKUP On-site Monotill details and Quanity takeoffs



5F of linear form: H OPE: 
$$
(165 \times 105) = 1
$$
  
110 x110> = 1

Communill  $\frac{10x10x2}{27}$  = 900 cy  $P^T P^c = (100 \times 10) + 100 = 1100 PT \text{ of } 4 \text{ inch } P00$ manhole 16 Foot deep.

PPPARSONS SHEET  $\angle$  of  $\angle$ JOB NO. BY PDM DATE NOV 5,1997 CKD. **REVISION** 

 $6"TLP5...1$  $zy''$  common  $f_1$ / GOML HDPE  $=6$ "sand - Fifter Fabric 24" sand leachet collection 4" PUC teachate cellection pipe too mil HAPE  $24$ " $c$ lay

 $\mathcal{L}^2_{\mathbb{Z}_2}$ 

 $11025$ 2100<br>3125 SF OF 60 ML HDPE

 $1100cy$ 



ිත  $\odot$  $\bigcirc$ ESTIMATE BACKUP. Paul Messelaur  $Nev$  5, 1997. FIGURE NO. 2  $\mu$ les Preliminary remodiation truce lines unctic Hear and a caser on them. REFER To Figure 5th immy P<br>PARSONS PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC. CLIENT/PROJECT TITLE SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY  $\,$  RI/FS  $\,$  SEAD–16 ABANDONED DEACTIVATION FURNACE  $\frac{D_{\text{WQ}} - N_{\text{O}}}{729695 - 01002}$ ENVIRONMETAL ENGINEERING FIGURE 2 T<br>SEAD-16 SOIL AND SEDIMENT<br>AREAS TO'BE REMEDIATED **JDATE** 



 $O$ Figure NO.3 SEAD 16 ESTIMATED SOIL OUCT 2000 ppm-lead ESTIMATE BACKUP BY Paul Messelaur  $617 - 859 - 2472$ DATE  $Nov6<sub>1</sub>1997$ , REFERENCE DRWAS  $Figure 4-3$  $F$ Iqure 4-8 These figures REPORT P<br>PARSONS **PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.** LIENT/PROJECT TITLE SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY RI/FS<br>SEAD-16 ABANDONED DEACTIVATION FURNACE  $\frac{D_{\text{WQ}} - N\alpha}{729895 - 01002}$ ENVIRONMETAL ENGINEERING **FIGURE 2 1** SEAD-16 SOIL AND SEDIMENT<br>AREAS TO BE REMEDIATED  $1^* = 100'$ OCTOBER 1997





LEGEND MINOR WATERWAY MAJOR WATERWAY **FENCE** UNPAVED ROAD mummun BRUSH LINE LANDFILL EXTENTS **RAILROAD GROUND SURFACE**<br>ELEVATION CONTOUR **SURVEY MONUMENT** €  $\overline{\sigma}$ ROAD SIGN DECIDOUS TREE  $\mathcal{R}$  $\otimes$ Δ FIRE HYDRANT MANHOLE GUIDE POST  $\odot$ UTILITY BOX CORDINATE GRID POLE  $\Theta$  $\Box$ OVERHEAD UTILITY MAILBOX/RR SIGNAL POLE ESTIMATE BACKUP BY PAUL MESSELAAR  $67 - 859 - 2476$ DATE: NOU 5, 1997 **EN EN DE LA SERVICIÓN DE LA SE** CASE 2 CASE<sub>3</sub>  $Thes-$ REFERENC DRWGS figures are in the  $F14$ URE  $4-12$ RI report  $FIUURE 4-15$ N **P**<br>PARSONS PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC. IENT/PROJECT TITLE SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY ELASTER PRI/FS<br>SEAD-17 ACTIVE DEACTIVATION FURNACE  $\frac{D*Q_1}{P^2}$  Mo.<br>729695-01002 ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING **TIGURE 8 8** SEAD-17 SOIL AND SEDIMENT<br>AREAS TO BE REMEDIATED  $\frac{SCAL}{1^* = 100^*}$ OCTOBER 1997 **A** 





 $\odot$ AH. 3 quantities [126 agents be washed 375 cy of clay/self<br>375 cy of clay/self volume = 3x.5x150 = 225 cf - 29 = 9 cr EGTMATZ BACKUP. Paul Messelaar NOV 5, 1997 Figure No. 5 SEAD 16 estimated total Volume of soil/sediment *Foot excavated* P<br>PARSONS PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC LIENT/PROJECT TITLE SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY RI/FS<br>SEAD-16 ABANDONED DEACTIVATION FURNACE  $\frac{p_{wQ}NQ}{729895 - 01002}$ ENVIRONMETAL ENGINEERING  $-$ FIGURE $-$ 1 SEAD-16 SOIL AND SEDIMENT AREAS TO BE REMEDIATED

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}d\mu\,d\mu\,.$ 





LEGEND MINOR WATERWAY MAJOR WATERWAY FENCE UNPAVED ROAD as Note Haz waste **BRUSH LINE** mummi LANDFILL EXTENTS **RAILROAD** GROUND SURFACE ELEVATION CONTOUR **SURVEY MONUMENT**  $\odot$  $\overline{\mathbf{T}}$ ROAD SIGN DECIDOUS TREE R  $^{\circ}$  $\triangle$ FIRE HYDRANT MANHOLE GUIDE POST  $\odot$  $+$ UTILITY BOX CORDINATE GRID POLE  $\Theta$ ⊡ OVERHEAD UTILITY MAILBOX/RR SIGNAL ESTIMATE BACKUP VOLUME OF SOIL/SEPIMENTS TO BE EXCAVATED Paul Messelaur NOV 5,1997. CASE 1 CASE 2 @ 5817-2 which  $[u_1]$  be expanded CASE 3 Figure No. 6 SEAD 17 estimated total  $228cY$ volume of sail to be excaved N PARSONS PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC. **IENT/PROJECT TITLE** SENECA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY  $\rm RI/FS$   $\rm SEAD-17$  ACTIVE DEACTIVATION FURNACE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING P=g Mo.<br>729895-01002  $FIGURE 2 2$ SEAD-17 SOIL AND SEDIMENT AREAS TO BE REMEDIATED

 $\label{eq:1.1} \begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{E}\left[\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{1$  $\sim 100\, \rm G$ 





 $0013C$ 

The majority of sail/sediment to<br>be executed on this project 13 soils<br>there fore use a 1/3 volume reductions<br>based on separating silt/elay from<br>gravel/sand.

 $FIGURE$  7 SENECA ARMY DEPOT-SEA016#17 RIFS COST ESTIMATE BACKUP Soil Washing-estimated volume reduction calculation  $B4$ :  $\theta$  aul Messelaur Date: Nov. 5, 1997.





section 5 Quotations

 $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $-10.5$ 

#### DOC7.DOC



November 12, 1997

Ms. Hillary Eiklor Parsons Engineering, Inc. 101 Huntington Avenue Boston, Massachusetts 02199

Dear Hillary:

On behalf of Earthwatch Waste Systems, Inc., I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to provide you with the following quotation for the transportation and disposal of the hazardous soil located in Romulus, NY.

**Hazardous Soil (D-Series)** 

\$75.00/ton Disposal: **Transportation:** \$75.00/ton

- $\triangleright$  Disposal pricing is contingent upon facility approval.
- $\triangleright$  There is a twenty-two (22) ton minimum on transportation.
- $\triangleright$  Payment terms to be granted upon completion of a credit application.

Earthwatch Waste Systems, Inc., welcomes the opportunity to service all of your waste disposal needs. If you have any questions regarding this proposal, pleases do not hesitate to contact me. Prices are valid for thirty (30) days and are subject to verification thereafter.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. McCune **Account Executive** 

"With An Eye On Your Future"

**CORPORATE AND SALES OFFICE:** 3527 Harlem Road · Buffalo, NY 14225 Phone (716) 833-3286 · Fax (716) 833-5670 Printed on recycled paper



November 12, 1997

Ms. Hillary Eiklor Parsons Engineering, Inc. 101 Huntington Avenue Boston, Massachusetts 02199

Dear Hillary:

On behalf of Earthwatch Waste Systems, Inc., I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to provide you with the following quotation for the transportation and disposal of the non-hazardous contaminated soil located in Romulus, NY.

#### **Ontario County Landfill, Stanley, NY.**



#### Approval Requirements: Full TCLP including Pesticides and Herbicides.

 $\triangleright$  There is a twenty-two (22) ton minimum on transportation.

 $\triangleright$  Payment terms to be granted upon completion of a credit application.

Earthwatch Waste Systems, Inc., welcomes the opportunity to service all of your waste disposal needs. If you have any questions regarding this proposal, pleases do not hesitate to contact me. Prices are valid for thirty (30) days and are subject to verification thereafter.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. McCune **Account Executive** 

"With An Eye On Your Future"

CORPORATE AND SALES OFFICE: 3527 Harlem Road · Buffalo, NY 14225 Phone (716) 833-3286 · Fax (716) 833-5670 Printed on recycled paper

#### PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC. TELEPHONE MEMORANDUM



Discussed pricing and acceptance requirements for disposal of materials from SEAD-16 and 17. He has sent a package of information to Don Yonika in the last month (refer to attached selected copies from this package), which shows that the landfill has adequate capacity and complies with Subtitle D requirements. Rocky confirmed pricing as follows, assuming the contaminated soil meets requirements:

**Transportation and Landfilling** 

 $$40/ton$ 





Comparative cost estimate Section 6

Alternative 1: Excavate/ Stabilize/ Off-site Disposal

 $\overline{K}$  and  $\overline{K}$  are  $\overline{K}$ 

DOC9.DOC

#### SENECA ARMY DEPOT SEAD 16 & 17 RIFS **COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY** ALTERNATIVE NO 1 EXCAVATE/STABILIZE/OFF-SITE DISPOSAL









## **SEAD 16 & 17**

# parsons engineering science

Roston , Massachusetts , 02199 617 262 3200 Prudential Center



 $$1,963.83$ <br> $$10,422.04$ <br> $$12,385.87$ 

### RA-



\$5,621.80<br>\$49,644.12

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 








Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm

Page 1

i.



Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm



Softbooks -- Detail by Treatm













Softoooks -- Juli Detail

11/16/97 2:27:35 PM



ü

11/16/97 2:27:39 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail



i<br>B

ó,



Softbooks -- Iuli Detail

11/16/97 2:27:40 PM







i<br>L

ÿ

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\frac{U}{\langle k \rangle}$ 

11/16/97 2:27:43 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



š

11/16/97 2:27:44 PM

×

Softbooks -- Full Detail





Softbooks -- Full Detail

11/16/97 2:27:46 PM



 $\mathcal{Q}$ 

11/16/97 2:27:47 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



11/16/97 2:27:47 PM

Softbooks -- Full Detail

Ļ

,



 $\epsilon^{-1/2}$ 

 $\mathfrak{S}(\cdot)$ 



D

 $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{N}}$ 

 $\bigcirc$ 

 $\sigma$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$