

.

38 1

File: C.G. 541.460d 38

FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY: DUNN FIELD

FOR

DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT MEMPHIS MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

August 1993

÷

ï

of Paliela3 Attachment A OF ATT Summary of changes to Engineering Report

38

.

Instruction	Pages to Remove	Pages to Insert
1	Outside Cover	Outside Cover
2	Inside Cover	Inside Cover
3	Table of Contents (iii, v)	Table of Contents (iii, v)
4	pp 1-1 to 1-3	pp 1-1 to 1-4
5	p 2-2	p 2-2
6	p 5-1	р 5 -1
7	pp 5-3 to 5-5	pp 5-3 to 5-5
8	p 5-7	р 5-7
9	pp 6-9 to 6-10	pp 6-9 to 6-10
10	pp 6-17 to 6-20	pp 6-17 to 6-21
11	Sect 9 (9-1 to 9-9)	pp 9-1 to 9-8
12	pp 10-4 to 10-14	pp 10-4 to 10-15
13	Appendix F (6/28/93)	Appendix F (8/19/93)
14	•	Add Appendix G

÷

SL016.23/LTR81993/ERDRFV

 \bigcirc

÷



ENGINEERING-SCIENCE

425 Woods Mill Road South Suite 150 Chesterfield, MO 63017 Telephone: (314) 576-7330 Fax: (314) 576-2702

2 July 1993

3

Commander U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Attn: CEHND-PM-AE (Dell'Orco) 106 Wynn Drive Huntsville, Alabama 35805-1957

RE: Draft-Final Engineering Report for Interim Remedial Measure Defense Distribution Region Central, Memphis, TN Contract DACA87-90-D-0030 ES-SL016.23

Dear Captain Dell'Orco:

Engineering-Science, Inc. (ES) is pleased to submit the Draft-Final Engineering Report for the Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water at Defense Distribution Region Central (DDRC) under the above referenced contract. This report has been prepared in response to comments from your agency dated 26 April 1993, comments from the U.S. EPA received 25 May 1993, and comments from the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation dated 16 June 1993.

ES appreciates this opportunity to serve the Huntsville Division. If you have any questions about this work, please give me a call.

Yours truly,

ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC.

David E. Mizell, P.E. Project Manager

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Commander U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Attention: CEHND-PM-EP (Dell'Orco) 106 Wynn Drive Huntsville, AL 35805-1957	4 Copies
Commander Defense Logistics Agency Attention: DLA-WE/Depot (Dennis Lillo) Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304	1 Сору
Commander U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency Attention: HSHB-ME-SG Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5422	2 Copies
Commander Defense Distribution Region Central Attention: DDRC-WP (Christine Kartman) 2163 Airways Blvd. Memphis, TN 38114-5000	3 Copies

-

٩

(

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	EX	ECUTIVE SUMMARY	1-1	
2.0	SC	OPE OF SERVICES	2-1	
3.0	SITE CHARACTERIZATION			
	3.1	Site Location and History	3-1	
	3.2	Topography and Geology	3.2	
	3.3	Surface Water Hydrology	3.5	
	3.4	Ground Water Hydrology	3.7	
		3.4.1 Regional Hydrogeology	3.7	
		3.4.2 Site Hydrogeology	3_0	
	3.5	Summary of Previous Investigations	-11	
4.0	PRE	ELIMINARY RISK ASSESSMENT	. 1	
	4.1	Identification of Receptors	4•1	
	4.2	Identification of Exposure Pathways	4-1 4-1	
	4.3	Comparison of Concentrations to Standards	4-2 7 7	
	4.4	Frequency of Detection of Chemicals of Concern	4-4	
	4.5	Risk Evaluation and Summary	4-9	
5.0	REN	ADIAL RESPONSE OBJECTIVES AND OBJECTA	F 1	
	5.1	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements	3-1 5 1	
		5.1.1 Types of ARARs	5-1 5-1	
	5.2	Ground Water Cleanup Goals	3-Z	
	5.3	Air Emission Requirements for Ground Water Treatment	5-8	
	-		2-0	
0.0	IDEI	NTIFICATION OF TECHNOLOGIES	6-1	
	6.1	Ground Water Extraction	5-1	
		6.1.1 Interceptor Trenches	5-1	
		6.1.2 Wells	5-2	
	6.2	Treatment	5-4	
		6.2.1 In-situ Treatment	5-4	
		6.2.2 Activated Carbon Adsorption for VOCs Removal	j-7	
		6.2.3 Air Stripping for VOCs Removal	5-9	
		6.2.4 UV/Oxidation for VOCs Removal	10	
		6.2.5 Biological Treatment for VOCs Removal	12	
		6.2.6 Precipitation for Metals Removal	14	
		6.2.7 Ion Exchange for Metals Removal	15	
		6.2.8 Off-Site Treatment	16	

(¹ ·

-

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	6.3	Disposal	-16
	-	6.3.1 Discharge to POTW	-17
		6.3.2 Discharge to Surface Drainage	-17
		6.3.3 Reinjection or Infiltration	-18
	6.4	Screened Technologies	-20
7.0	HY	DROGEOLOGIC IMPACTS	7.1
	7.1	Introduction	/=1 7 1
	7.2	Selection of Model	7_7 7_7
	7.3	DREAM Model Calibration	7-A
	7.4	Simulations of Candidate Pumping Scenarios	7-5
		7.4.1 Extraction Wells On-Site (Scenario 1)	7-8
		7.4.2 Extraction Wells On/Off- Site (Scenario 2)	10
		7.4.3 Extraction and Reinjection Wells (Scenario 3)7-	12
	7.5	Comparison of Ground Water Control Scenarios	12
	7.6	Impacts of Pumping Scenarios	14
		7.6.1 Impacts on Nearby Domestic or Production Wells	14
		7.6.2 Impacts on Nearby Surface Water	15
		7.6.3 Reinjection of Treated Water	15
8.0	DEI		
0.0	21 21	Alternative 1	-1
	82	Alternative 2	-1
	83	Alternative 3	-3
	84	Alternative d	-8
	8.5	Alternative 5	-9
	8.6	Alternative 6	10
	8.7	Alternative 7	10
• •			11
9.0	PER	MIT CONSIDERATIONS	-1
10.0	DET	AILED ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	-1
	10 . f	Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment	-1
	10.2	Compliance with ARARs	-3
	10.3	Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence	.3
	10.4	Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume Through Treatment 10-	4
	10.5	Short-Term Effectiveness	4
	10.6	Implementability	5
	10.7	Cost	7
	10.8	State Acceptance 10-	8
		· .	

.

-

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	10.9 Community Acceptance	10-10
11.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
	11.1 Conclusions	
	11.2 Recommendations	
12.0	REFERENCES	

APPENDICES

Α	List of Agencies and Persons Consulted

- B Memphis-Shelby County Air Pollution Control Guidelines Section 1200-3-18-.02
- C February 5, 1991 Letter sent to the Governor of Tennessee From the Regional Administrator of EPA Region IV
- D Permit Forms and Requirements
- E List of Vendors and Manufacturers Contacted
- F Cost Estimates

,

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLES

Table 4.1	Comparison of Constituents to Standards	1.6
Table 4.2	Frequency of Detection Above Maximum Contaminant Levels	4-0
	(1989, 1990 and 1992)	4-8
Table 5.1	Tentative Cleanup Goals	5-9
Table 6.1	Technologies Screened and Retained for Consideration	6-21
Table 8.1	Summary of Remedial Alternatives	8_7
Table 8.2	Expected Concentrations in Extracted Ground Water.	
Table 8.3	Summary of VOC Loadings to Air and Water-Alternative 2	
Table 9.1	Permit Requirements for Ground Water Treatment Technologies	9_4
Table 10.1	Description of Alternative Screening Criteria	10.2
Table 10.2	Summary of Costs	10-0
Table 10.3	Detailed Analysis of Alternatives	10-12

FIGURES

Figure 3.1	Location of Defense Distribution Region Central	3.2
Figure 3.2	Topography of Dunn Field Vicinity	2-2 1.1
Figure 3.3	Surface Drainage Off Dunn Field	،
Figure 3.4	Existing Monitoring Wells Dunn Field Vicinity	0-C
Figure 3.5	Ground Water Flow Patterns Fluvial Aquifer Dunn Field Vicinity	
<u> </u>	September 1992	3-10
Figure 3.6	Dunn Field Disposal and Storage Sites	
Figure 3.7	Volatile Organics Contamination Extent in Fluvial Aquifer	
	(Law Figure 4-4)	
Figure 3.8	Extent of Elevated Metals in Fluvial Aquifer (Law Figure 4-5)	3-15
Figure 4.1	Potential Ground Water Exposure Pathway for Contaminants	
	in Dunn Field	4-3
Figure 7.1	Groundwater Elevation Contour Map 1992	
Figure 7.2	Simulated Groundwater Elevation Contour Man	7-7
Figure 7.3	Scenario 1	7.0
Figure 7.4	Scenario 2	······ /-۶ 7_11
Figure 7.5	Scenario 3	

38 9-

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Defense Distribution Region Central (DDRC) proposes to install an interim ground water pumping and treatment system to control ground water contamination beneath the Dunn Field area. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and metals have been found in monitor wells in the unconfined Fluvial Aquifer beneath the northwest part of Dunn Field since 1989. While the extent of contamination is not fully known, DDRC proposes to install a pumping and treatment system as an initial measure until the full extent of contamination has been defined.

The objective of this Removal Action is to mitigate off-site migration of contaminants and to treat, on an interim basis, ground water contaminated with VOCs and metals to below USEPA and State of Tennessee action levels. This action is being undertaken as a non-time critical removal action under CERCLA to treat ground water contaminants in the fluvial aquifer and prevent possible human exposure. When the full extent of contamination has been defined, DDRC will cooperate with State and Federal regulators to select a permanent remedial measure.

Metals in the aquifer were above action levels in 1989 and 1990, but below action levels in 1992. Another round of sampling and analysis for metals is required to determine if metals warrant remedial action. Treatment for VOCs is part of this action, with an option to treat for metals if metals are found above cleanup goals.

A variety of technologies were examined to achieve extraction and treatment of contaminated ground water, followed by disposal of treated water. These technologies included air stripping, UV/oxidation, and *in situ* methods of treatment for VOCs. Technologies considered for treatment of metals included precipitation and ion

exchange. Seven alternatives were developed using suitable technologies:

- 1) No Action
- Extract ground water using pumping wells located within Dunn Field, treat using air stripper techniques, followed by disposal into the municipal sewer system. Treat for metals as required.
- 3) Extract ground water using pumping wells located within Dunn Field and off Government property, treat using air stripper techniques, followed by disposal into the municipal sewer system. Treat for metals as required.
- Extract ground water using pumping wells located within Dunn Field, treat using UV/oxidation techniques, followed by disposal into the municipal sewer system. Treat for metals as required.
- 5) Extract ground water using pumping wells located within Dunn Field, treat using air stripper techniques, followed by disposal into surface drainage. Treat for metals as required.
- Extract ground water using pumping wells located within Dunn Field, treat using UV/oxidation techniques, followed by disposal into surface drainage. Treat for metals as required.
- Extract ground water using pumping wells located within Dunn Field, treat using air stripper techniques, followed by reinjection into the Fluvial Aquifer. Treat for metals as required.

These alternatives were evaluated for protection of human health and the environment; compliance with ARARs; long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility and volume; short-term effectiveness; implementability; cost; state acceptance; and community acceptance.

A hydrologic evaluation of these control options was performed using the ground water model DREAM. An extraction system utilizing eight wells located in Dunn Field and penetrating into the Fluvial Aquifer provides control of contaminated ground water beneath Government property, and provides some control of contaminated ground

waters adjacent to Government property. Using two extraction wells off-site modifies the control pattern for contaminated ground water, but does not significantly enhance capture in those areas. Further investigation and delineation of contaminated areas off site is required before an effective off-site control strategy can be defined. Disposal of treated water by reinjection into the Fluvial Aquifer accelerates the removal of contaminants in ground water beneath Dunn Field, but reduces the capture of off-site contaminants.

The preferred alternative is Alternative 5, in which water is extracted on-site and treated using air stripping, followed by discharge to surface water discharge. This alternative is responsive to protecting human health and the environment, complying with ARARs, and is effective in the short-term. This alternative offers the fewest obstacles to implementation, is cost-effective, and would appear acceptable to both the State and the community.

STATEMENT OF INTENT AND REGULATORY BASIS

This Engineering Report (ER) is intended to meet all requirements of the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) under CERCLA and the National Contingency Plan (NCP) for a non-time critical removal. All work relating to the proposed removal action was initiated by DDRC in 1991. This work included: preparation of a pump test work plan (which was approved by both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation); performance of an aquifer pump test; a report on the results of the aquifer pump test; this report; and an Environmental Assessment (EA) to investigate and document possible effects on the environment resulting from this removal action. The next phase of this project will be the design of the preferred alternative followed by the construction of the preferred alternative. The purpose of this removal action is to treat

38 1.2

ground water contaminants in the fluvial aquifer and prevent further migration of contaminants to greatly reduce the threat of possible human exposure.

This document will be released for public comment in accordance with CERCLA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A responsiveness summary/response to comments will be prepared following the public comment period. Comments from the public and the regulatory community will be either incorporated into the documents or a valid reason why the comment cannot be incorporated will be provided. The term "Interim Remedial Measure" (IRM) is used in this report as a descriptor of the preferred alternative. The equivalent CERCLA terminology for "IRM" is "removal action." Reviewers of this report should be aware that the preferred alternative will be implemented under CERCLA and NCP provisions that permit the facility (DDRC) to perform a removal action. DDRC intends to remain as the lead agency in implementing this preferred alternative and will cooperate with other Federal, State, and local agencies to accomplish this task.

;

2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

This Engineering Report is the result of conceptual design activities to develop an Interim Remedial Measure for ground water contamination at DDRC. The services performed during this activity are described as follows:

- Develop Work Plan A Work Plan was developed for installation of one pump test well and three nearby observation wells into the Fluvial Aquifer beneath the northwest corner of Dunn Field. Existing nearby wells were also available to serve as observation wells.
- 2) Install Pump Test Well and Observation Wells Wells were drilled to a depth of approximately 80 feet below the land surface. Chemical samples of soil cuttings were collected and analyzed for organic and inorganic constituents, and these results were used to develop data for the Interim Remedial Measure.
- 3) Perform Pump Test A step-drawdown test and a 42-hour pump test was conducted to determine aquifer properties. A sustained flow rate of 24 gallons per minute (gpm) created a drawdown of 4.1 feet at the end of the test. Three chemical samples of the pump test water contained VOCs. Water was treated using activated carbon units and contained for further testing prior to release. Three samples of this water exhibited no significant contamination.
- 4) Pump Test Data Analysis Pump test data was examined using the Theis Method, Cooper and Jacob Method, and Neuman's Method modified by Boulton. The estimated yield of this well was 75 gpm and would have a radius of influence of 420 feet. These findings were presented in a Pump Test Technical Memorandum (1992 ES).
- 5) Determine Ground Water Cleanup Levels Contaminated ground water shall be treated to cleanup levels satisfying federal, state and local requirements. Cleanup levels are presented in this report to satisfy these requirements.

6) Evaluate Treated Ground water Disposal Options - Options to dispose of contaminated ground water include discharge to a publically-owned treatment works (POTW), discharge to surface drainage, reinjection back into the Fluvial Aquifer, and trucking off-site for disposal. These options are evaluated in this report.

7) Determine Air Emissions Requirements - The presence of VOCs in the contaminated ground water will create emissions to the atmosphere following extraction. This report examines emission standards for the IRM, and describes actions to meet regulatory requirements.

 Evaluate Hydrologic Impacts - The hydrologic impacts of candidate extraction systems are described in this report. Recommendations are presented for extraction well locations. The impacts of re-injection are also evaluated.

- 9) Determine Permit Requirements Permit requirements for the construction and operation of the IRM have been defined through contacts with regulatory agencies. DDRC will comply with substantive ARAR's identified by Federal, State, and local agencies. Section 121(e) of CERCLA exempts any response action conducted on-site from having to obtain a Federal, State, local permit. Under the Clean Water Act, operation of the preferred alternative would be considered to be a direct discharge. By EPA definition, direct discharge of wastewater is considered to be on-site if the receiving water body is in the area of contamination or is in very close proximity to the site and is necessary for implementation of the response action (even if the water body flows offsite).
- 10) Recommend Treatment Alternative The best IRM alternative shall be recommended based upon economics, technical feasibility, regulatory requirements, and environmental impacts.
- Develop Cost Estimate for Alternatives Cost estimates for the IRM alternatives are developed and presented in this report.

ż

÷

ţ

3.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION

3.1 Site Location and History

DDRC is situated on 642 acres of federal land in the city of Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee. Figure 3.1 shows the location and layout of DDRC. DDRC consists of two sections: the main installation, which is intensely developed, and Dunn Field, an open storage area about 64 acres in size located north of the main installation. The installation lies in the south central section of Memphis, 4 miles southeast of the central business district and 1 mile north of the Memphis International Airport. DDRC is in a mixed residential, commercial, and industrial area.

Defense Depot Memphis began operations in 1942 with the mission to inventory and supply materials for the U. S. Army. In 1964, the Depot's mission was expanded to include a complete range of commodities for Department of Defense activities, under the auspices of the Defense Supply Agency, now known as the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). The Depot became known as Defense Distribution Region Central (DDRC) in 1991 to reflect a further expanded mission over this and several other DLA facilities throughout the central United States.

DDRC warehouses and distributes an extensive inventory of supplies to U.S. military services and federal agencies. These supplies span a broad range of commodities including clothing, food, medical supplies, electronic equipment, petroleum products, and industrial chemicals.

Until 1970, hazardous and nonhazardous materials whose containers were damaged or whose shelf life had expired were occasionally burned and/or buried in a portion of Dunn Field. Wastes disposed of in this manner included: oil and grease, paint and paint thinner, methyl bromide, pesticides, herbicides, and food supplies. Other wastes



;

included minute quantities of mustard and lewisite gases contained in nine training canisters. Most of the documented hazardous materials which were disposed during this period were buried in the northwest portion of Dunn Field.

3.2 Topography and Geology

The topography of Dunn Field can be characterized as a level to gently rolling open area. Figure 3.2 shows the ground surface contours around Dunn Field recorded in feet above Mean Sea Level. Dunn Field is unpaved; about half of the area is grass covered and the other half is gravel parking or material storage. An arc-shaped ridge separates the northeast quadrant from the remainder of Dunn Field. From the ridge and the northeast corner of Dunn Field, the terrain gently slopes toward a naturally occurring drainage ditch which conveys runoff northward off the installation. The northwest quadrant of Dunn Field, formerly used for burial of hazardous and non-hazardous materials, is a level to gently sloping grassy area. The southwest quadrant is grassed and gently sloping. The southeast quadrant of Dunn Field is level and is used for open and covered storage of bulk materials.

The Dunn Field area of DDRC is covered by loess deposits, which are underlain by the Fluvial Deposit, the Jackson Clay/Upper Claiborne Group, and the Memphis Sand (1990 Law). More information about these units is summarized below:

- Locss Directly underlying the Dunn Field is locss, a semi-cohesive windblown deposit of silt, silty sand, and silty clay. It is about 20 feet thick in the Dunn Field vicinity and may occasionally reach 30 feet in thickness. Thin, discontinuous fine grained sand lenses may occur locally within the loess.
- Fluvial Deposit Underlying the loess is the fluvial deposit. This unit consists of a top layer of silty clay, silty sand, or clayey sand; a clean, fine to medium-grained sand; and a basal gravelly sand. While the gravelly sand layer frequently occurs below the fine sand layer, some borings at DDRC exhibit additional fine sand layers below the gravelly sand.

2 2



The upper sand layers are orange color indicating an oxidation environment. The lower layers are very clean, tan to white sand. The sand layers become coarser downwards into the gravelly sand. Gravel size ranges from peasized pebbles to cobbles. The thickness of the fluvial deposit in Dunn Field ranges from 50 to 70 feet.

Jackson Clay and Upper Claiborne Group - The Jackson Clay and the Upper Claiborne are laterally persistent and fairly uniform in thickness, approximately 80 feet, throughout Dunn Field. This unit thins markedly in the area immediately south of Dunn Field. It is a stiff gray or orange plastic, lean to fat lignitic clay. It forms a regional confining bed separating the Fluvial Deposit and the underlying Memphis Sand.

The top of the Claiborne Formation slopes toward the northwest and west beneath most of Dunn Field with a gradient of about one percent; however, the top surface slopes southwestward beneath the extreme southern portion of Dunn Field at a rate of about 7 percent.

Memphis Sand - The Memphis Sand of the Claiborne Group is also called the 500-foot Sand because its center occurs generally at 500-foot below ground level. This formation ranges from 500 to 900 feet in thickness. At Dunn Field, the top of the Memphis Sand is at about 180 feet below ground level along the west property line and at approximately 140 feet below ground level along the east property line. The formation is composed of thin bedded, white to brown or gray, very fine grained to gravelly, partially argillaceous and micaceous sand.

Underneath the Memphis Sand is the Flour Island confining bed. This formation ranges from 150 to 300 feet in thickness.

3.3 Surface Water Hydrology

Due to its high relative elevation, Dunn Field receives little or no stormwater runoff from adjacent areas outside DDRC. The exposed, undisturbed surface soils in Dunn Field are primarily grassed, fine-grained semi-cohesive materials which promote runoff following storm events. Figure 3.3 presents the surface drainage boundaries at Dunn Field and shows the direction of runoff.

The majority of drainage from Dunn Field proceeds by overland flow to adjacent properties outside DDRC to the north and west. The northeast quadrant drains to the

35



38 .21

east to either a concrete-lined, open channel or to adjacent properties to the north. The concrete-lined channel conveys stormwater from the adjacent residential neighborhood east of Hays Road through the northeast quadrant of Dunn Field. Runoff from the northwest quadrant of Dunn Field flows overland to the roadside ditch along Kyle Street. The remainder of the Dunn Field runoff flows overland to the west onto adjacent properties outside DDRC. The natural relief in the central west side of Dunn Field drains runoff into an unlined ditch which conveys stormwater east. Both the concrete-lined channel in the northeast quadrant and this unlined ditch direct flow northward to Cane Creek, a tributary of Noncannah Creek.

3.4 Ground Water Hydrology

3.4.1 <u>Regional Hydrogeology</u>

et 1

Water supply systems in the Memphis area depend heavily upon ground water resources. The uppermost aquifer beneath Dunn Field is the Fluvial Aquifer, which is not used in the Memphis area for drinking water because of variable water quality, high hardness, and elevated iron concentrations. Furthermore, because the loess deposits allow infiltration and recharge to the Fluvial Aquifer, this unit is susceptible to contamination from the surface.

Beneath the Fluvial Aquifer lies the Memphis Sand Aquifer, which is the shallowest artesian aquifer in the area. The Memphis Sand Aquifer is heavily used for municipal water supplies in the Memphis area, providing about 200 million gallons per day (MGD) to the City of Memphis and the surrounding unincorporated areas. The Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division operates ten wellfields in Shelby County, Tennessee, extensively using the Memphis Sand Aquifer. The closest of these wellfields to Dunn Field is the Alten wellfield, which is about 1 to 1.5 miles west of DDRC. A number of monitoring wells have been installed to characterize the Fluvial and Memphis Sand Aquifers in and around Dunn Field, Figure 3.4.



The Fort Pillow Sand Aquifer lies beneath the Memphis Sand and is not significant in this study because of its depth and because its hydraulic head is higher than the Memphis Sand stratum.

3.4.2 <u>Site Hydrogeology</u>

 <u>Loess</u> - The loess is not typically a water bearing zone. There is no evidence that it produces water to wells in the DDRC vicinity. The loess deposits permit recharge into underlying fluvial deposit during rainfall events.

Seasonal perched ground water may occur within the loess. Monitoring well MW-2 is 30 feet deep and screened within the loess. It exhibits water at the bottom following rainfall events but dries out afterward. Water levels in adjacent wells completed in the Fluvial Aquifer are approximately 60 feet below ground level. The perched water table in northern Dunn Field is a clay-silt layer enclosed within the loess. The extent of this perched zone is not known.

Fluvial Deposit - The fluvial deposit forms the water table aquifer in the Dunn Field vicinity. In this area, the Fluvial Aquifer is about 15 to 20 feet thick and receives recharge from rainfall infiltration through overlying loess and lateral ground water inflow from the east. Discharge is toward the Mississippi River to the west and possibly by leakage into the underlying Memphis Sand through the Jackson/Upper Claiborne confining bed.

Based on data collected during the RI/FS (Law, 1990), the Fluvial Aquifer beneath Dunn Field is moving generally toward the west (Figure 3.5). Based on data collected during the pump test, the calculated ground water flow velocity in the Fluvial Aquifer is 0.006 feet per minute. This is based on an average hydraulic conductivity of 6.91 x 10^{-2} feet per minute and an assumed porosity of 0.20.

Jackson Clay/Upper Claiborne Formation - The Jackson Clay/Upper Claiborne unit is a regional confining bed which separates the Fluvial Aquifer from the Memphis Sand Aquifer. Through erosion, this unit is thinned at DDRC immediately south of Dunn Field. It is documented (1989 Smith and Ishak/Muhamad) that some areas of the Memphis Sand are directly overlain by the fluvial deposit. No interconnections have been found between the Memphis Sand and the Fluvial Aquifer in the DDRC vicinity.



(

(

38 25 ·

December 1989 measurements of MW-32 (Fluvial Aquifer) and MW-37 (Memphis Sand Aquifer) indicated that the water elevation of the Fluvial Aquifer was at 226 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL), compared to the water level in the Memphis Sand of 143 feet MSL. The hydraulic head difference is about 83 feet.

Memphis Sand - The top of Memphis Sand is approximately 125 to 150 feet above MSL in the vicinity of DDRC. The base of this unit is about -750 feet MSL. Thus, the aquifer is about 900 feet thick and is under confined conditions. Recharge to the aquifer occurs from rainfall infiltration on the outcrop located to the east of the site and possibly from leakage from the overlying Fluvial Aquifer. The Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division (MLGW) operates eight well fields which extract water from the Memphis Sand for municipal supply. The Allen wellfield, located 1 to 2 miles to the west of DDRC, is one of these fields. Water levels in the two Memphis Sand wells installed during the RI/FS (1990 Law) suggest a gradient toward the west.

3.5 Summary of Previous Investigations

A variety of environmental and industrial hygiene studies have been conducted at DDRC over the past two decades, as described in Section 4.0 of Volume I of the RI/FS Work Plan (1989 Law). An installation assessment of hazardous materials practices was prepared to assess potential sources of contamination (1981 USATHAMA). The burial sites at Dunn Field were identified (see Figure 3.6) and categorized as having the greatest potential for off site migration. As a result of this study, a geohydrologic evaluation was conducted (1982 AEHA). Seven wells were installed in the northwest quadrant of Dunn Field to determine ground water quality and ground water elevations. Ground water from six of the wells were sampled and analyzed for inorganic compounds including fluoride, chloride, phenol and metals. The results did not reflect any serious ground water contamination from the disposal operations in Dunn Field. No samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds.



SL016.23/67592801/213-20

A RCRA Facility Assessment (RFA) was performed in 1989 which identified Solid Waste Management Units, SWMU, and Areas of Concern, AOC (1990 A.T. Kearney). The purpose of the RFA was to assess the release potential of hazardous constituents from these units. Further investigatory sampling and analysis were recommended for the SWMUs identified in Dunn Field.

To satisfy CERCLA requirements, the decision was made to carry out a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at DDRC. Law Environmental, Inc. was retained and developed RI/FS work plans (1989 Law). The RI/FS field investigations were completed in 1990 (1990 Law).

During the RI study, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and metals were found in ground water beneath Dunn Field at levels exceeding the federal primary drinking water standards. Ground water samples were analyzed for the 129 priority pollutants excluding asbestos and cyanide.

Volatile_Organic Compounds - Eleven volatile organic compounds were detected in the Fluvial Aquifer. The plumes of tetrachloroethene; 1,1,2,2-tetrachlorothane; and 1,1-dichloroethene were illustrated in Figure 4-4 of the RI, page 3-14 of this chapter. Due to ground water flow and past hazardous waste disposal site locations, the plumes appear aligned with the north and west property lines. Well MW-30 is the northern boundary and MW-33 is the southern boundary of the plumes. The western boundary of these plumes has not been delineated.

A trichoroethene (TCE) plume was found at the highest concentrations of all the VOCs detected at Dunn Field. TCE was about 2 ug/L at MW-15 and 1,500 ug/L at MW-12 during the Phase I RI (April 1989). TCE was about the same concentration at MW-15 during Phase II RI (January 1990) but had increased to 5,100 ug/L in MW-12.

Metals - Figure 4-5 of the RI, shown on page 3-15 of this chapter, presents the concentration contour maps for chromium and lead. These plumes cover a wider area than the organic plumes, possibly because the releases of metals occurred first. However, metals were also found in the background well (MW-16) during the RI/FS. This well is located in the northeast corner of the main installation, and has water levels that are upgradient of the entire



;



installation. This well exhibited chromium at 50 to 55 ug/L, lead at 80 ug/L, and nickel at 29 to 40 ug/L during the RI/FS (1990 Law). The lead and chromium both exceed the federal MCLs, and the nickel exceeds the State of Tennessee criterion. Lead exceeds the U.S. EPA action level of 15 ug/L. The presence of these metals in the background well indicates they may originate from more than one source in the DDRC vicinity.

 <u>Memphis Sand Aquifer</u> - Two wells from the RI study are installed in the Memphis Sand. MW-36 is located at the southeast corner of Dunn Field and can be considered as an upgradient well. MW-37 is located west of Dunn Field (Figure 3.4) and is a downgradient well. These wells exhibited only low levels of metals. Acetone was detected in the water sample from MW-37 at a concentration of 3,500 ug/L.

Three wells (126, 127, and 128) of the Allen Well Field were closed due to VOCs contamination. The Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division is investigating the cause of the contamination but the source has not been identified. Other Allen Well Field wells located between these three wells and DDRC do not exhibit VOC contamination.

The RI/FS concluded that the plume of contaminated ground water had migrated in a generally west and northwest direction. The source was believed to be from the waste material burial trenches in the northwest quadrant of Dunn Field. The western extent of the plume was not defined. Additional investigations were recommended to more fully delineate the plume and to better characterize the Fluvial Aquifer so that an effective remedial measure could be designed. In 1992, DDRC was placed on the National Priorities List (NPL) (57 FR 47180, October 14, 1992).

Engineering-Science, Inc. (ES) was retained in 1991 to perform a pumping test of the Fluvial Aquifer, conduct a follow-on RI/FS to fill data gaps left by the previous RI/FS, and recommend and design an Interim Remedial Measure (IRM) system for Dunn Field. The pumping test was conducted in September 1992. A pumping test well and three piezometers were installed in the northwest corner of Dunn Field. The Fluvial Aquifer was found to be relatively isotropic. The data generated from this test was used to

estimate the following parameters (1992 ES):

transmissivity	1.385 ft ² /min
hydraulic conductivity	6.91 x 10 ⁻² ft/min
specific yield	0.19
specific capacity	5.84 gpm/ft
well efficiency	83%
well yield	75 gpm
radius of influence	420 ft

Ground water extracted during the pumping test was sampled at beginning, midpoint, and end of the 42-hour long, constant-discharge test. The extracted ground water was filtered to remove particulates, treated with activated carbon to remove VOCs and then stored. Samples were collected from the treated water. All water samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds (including chloroacetophenone), pesticides, PCBs, selected metals, agent mustard, and thiodiglycol. Further discussion of these results is presented in Section 4.3 of this report.

4.0 PRELIMINARY RISK ASSESSMENT

Ground water contaminants beneath Dunn Field create a potential threat to human health and the environment in the absence of a remedial measure. The risk assessment at Dunn Field incorporates data identifying the extent, nature, and potential transport of contaminants with potential ground water exposure pathways and receptors in order to characterize potential human or environmental risks associated with the site. This risk assessment is intended to address only ground water pathways in the Dunn Field area of DDRC. A baseline risk assessment for the entire facility was included in the RI/FS (1990 Law) which evaluated risks associated with soil, air and water.

4.1 Identification of Receptors

The potential human receptors for the facility include the residents of Memphis, and the employees and neighbors of DDRC.

The city of Memphis is approximately 300 square miles in size and had a 1990 population of 610,337 people. Although the city is experiencing a 5.3 percent negative annual population growth, it still remains the largest city in Tennessee. The three largest industries in the Memphis Metropolitan Statistical Area are as follows: 1) the wholesale and retail industry, which employs approximately 125,600 persons; 2) the service industry, which employs approximately 120,200; and 3) the government, which includes federal, state and city, which employs approximately 75,700 people. The average per capita and household income in Memphis is estimated to be \$12,593 and \$33,432 respectively.

There are eight permanent residences located within DDRC boundaries. These residences are located in the southcastern quadrant of the facility. The average number of residents living at DDRC at any one time is about twenty-five people.

4.2 Identification of Exposure Pathways

ł

An exposure pathway is a route for contaminated material to reach a receptor. This pathway must have a source of contamination, a transport medium and an exposure point. The exposure pathway for the potentially contaminated ground water at Dunn Field is discussed below.

The primary source of ground water contamination in Dunn Field is believed to be from waste materials buried in unlined trenches. The transporting mechanism is rain water infiltrating through these buried wastes into the underlying soils. Some contaminants such as volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and metals, are leached from the wastes, transported downward through the soil, and introduced into the upper-most aquifer beneath Dunn Field. This aquifer, known as the Fluvial Aquifer, is separated from the Memphis Sand Aquifer by a clay layer. There is potential for the Fluvial Aquifer to recharge into the Memphis Sand Aquifer, which serves as the public water supply in the Memphis metropolitan area. The potential exposure points and routes of exposure for ground water constituents include the following:

- 1. Ingestion of ground water (Memphis Sand aquifer only)
- 2. Skin contact with potentially contaminated potable water during bathing and
- 3. Inhalation of vapors from volatile organic compounds present in potable water, which are emitted during household use.

Figure 4.1 presents this potential ground water exposure pathway for the contaminants in Dunn Field.



1

Constituents of concern were identified in Dunn Field monitoring wells screened in the Fluvial Aquifer. These constituents include the following compounds or elements:

Volatile Organic Compounds 1,1 dichloroethene 1,2 dichloroethene (total) 1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethane tetrachloroethene carbon tetrachloride <u>Metals (unconfirmed)</u> arsenic barium chromium lead nickel

3

1

Constituents of concern in the Fluvial Aquifer have not been detected in Memphis Sand ground water samples (MW-36 and 37). However these constituents were present in some soil borings (1990 Law). One VOC, acetone, was found in MW-37 during the second phase of the 1990 RI/FS, but this observation has not been confirmed by a second sample. Acetone is a common laboratory contaminant, which is the potential source of the 1990 observation. Acetone was not found in any consistent pattern in the overlying Fluvial aquifer during the RI/FS, which strongly suggests that Dunn Field was not the source of acetone in MW-37. Nonetheless, leakage of VOCs and metals through the confining unit into the Memphis Sand Aquifer can potentially occur in areas not yet identified.

4.3 Comparison of Concentrations to Standards

The U.S. EPA has established Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) and Maximum Contaminant Level Goals (MCLGs) for a number of chemicals. The State of Tennessee has adopted guidelines which are equivalent to the federal guidelines (Appendix A). By definition, the MCLGs are nonenforceable goals while the MCLs are enforceable standards which must be set as close to the MCLGs as feasible. The MCLs combine health effects information on specific constituents with other inputs on exposure, methods for chemical analysis, methods of treatment, economics, etc. The total human

A . A
exposure to specific contaminants is considered in developing the MCL, which attempts to set lifetime limits at the lowest practical level to minimize the amount of toxicity contributed by drinking water. A daily intake of two liters of water is assumed in developing these regulations (Dec. 1989 U.S. EPA).

The constituents of concern found in the Fluvial Aquifer beneath Dunn Field occur at concentrations above the MCLs or MCLGs (Table 4.1). The comparison was made for data collected during Phase 1 of the RI (1989), Phase II of the RI (1990) and the Pump Test conducted in Dunn Field in 1992. Table 4.1 summarizes this data for both VOCs and metals. Highlights of this data are discussed below.

Trichloroethene was detected above the MCL of 5 micrograms per liter (ug/L) in samples collected from 1989, 1990 and 1992. Trichloroethene was found as high as 5,100 ug/L during the RI at MW-12 (1,020 times the MCL). In 1992, the samples collected from the PTW exhibited as much as 360 ug/L of trichloethene (72 times the MCL).

The MCL for tetrachloroethene is 5 ug/L. Tetrachloroethene was detected as high as 240 ug/L in MW-10 in 1990 (48 times the MCL). In 1992, the pump test well exhibited as much as 100 ug/L (20 times the MCL).

The VOC 1,1-dichloroethene, which has an MCL of 7 ug/L, was detected in MW-10 at 160 ug/L in 1990 (23 times the MCL). In 1992, the PTW exhibited as much as 50 ug/L of 1,1-dichloroethene (7.1 times the MCL).

The highest levels of metals detected at Dunn Field are summarized in Table 4.1. The action level for lead is 15 ug/L. In 1989, water samples from MW-10 exhibited lead at 653 ug/L, while in 1990 lead was at 1,000 ug/L in this well (67 times the action level). In 1992, the level of lead in the pump test well (located about 100 feet away from MW-10) was 1.6 ug/L. Nickel shows a similar pattern, being present in both MW-7 and

4-5

Constituent	MCL (ug/L)	RI Phase I Highest Levels 1989 (ug/L)	RI Phase II Highest Levels 1990 (ug/L)	Pump Test Highest Levels 1992 PTW (ug/L)	
Volatile Organic Comp 1, 1 dichloroether 1,2 dichloroether tetrachloroethene trichloroethene carbon tetrachlor	e (total) 70 5 6 6 5 5 5 5	130 (MW-10) 520 ³ (MW-11) 210 (MW-5) 1,700 ³ (MW-12) 77 (MW-6)	160 (MW-10) 510 ³ (MW-12) 240 ³ (MW-12) 5,100 ³ (MW-10) 40 (MW-5)	220 200 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	
<u>Metals</u> arsenic barium chromium lead nickel	2,000 ¹ 50 15 ²	85 (MW-10) 3,740 ⁴ (MW-14) 1,240 ⁴ (MW-14) 653 ⁴ (MW-10) 602 ⁴ (MW-7)	210 (MW-14) 1,900 (MW-10) 340 (MW-10) 1,000 (MW-10) 170 (MW-7 & 10)	ND 5.4 ND ND	•
Source: ES, 1993.					
Notes: 1 - Maximum 2 - Action Lev 3 - identified in 4 - spiked sam	Contaminant Leve el n the analysis fron ple recovery not v	el Goals (MCLG) n-a secondary dilution factor. vithin control limits.	Abbreviati ug/L - ND - MW - PTW -	ons: micrograms per liter Not detected Monitoring Well Pump Test Well	

4-6

Action Level identified in the analysis from a secondary dilution factor. spiked sample recovery not within control limits. . . .

016.23 TAB41-ER/ERDRF1/June 16, 1993

37 38

TABLE 4.1

ŀ _

•

Comparison of Constituents to Standards in Dunn Field Ground Water

MW-10 above the MCL in 1989/1990, but not found in the 1992 pump test. The three ground water samples from the 1992 pump test all exhibited arsenic, barium, chromium, lead and nickel below the MCLs, and suggest a lack of metals contamination over the 42 hour duration of pumping, particularly since water was drawn into the well from the surrounding aquifer. The discrepancy in metals contamination from 1990 to 1992 strongly suggests that another round of sampling is needed, in which all monitoring wells in the Dunn Field vicinity and the pump test well are tested. Once this is done, a decision can be made concerning the treatment of metals in the proposed IRM.

4.4 Frequency of Detection of Chemicals of Concern

During the RI study in 1989 and 1990, ground water samples were collected from 17 monitoring wells in Dunn Field. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and metals were detected in the ground water at levels exceeding the MCLs and the State of Tennessee guidelines. During the pumping test conducted in 1992, three ground water samples were collected from the pump test well location. During the pump test, the same VOCs were detected at levels exceeding the federal MCLs. However, metals were not found above MCLs, raising the question about their significance in the ground water beneath Dunn Field.

The frequency that VOCs and metals exceeded the MCLs was compiled to illustrate the spatial extent and persistence of these constituents (Table 4.2). This analysis considered ground water samples analyzed during the RI/FS Phase I (March and April 1989) and Phase II (January 1990) and the pumping test (September 1992). Table 4.2 lists the VOCs and metals that were detected and their corresponding MCLs. The range of detection for each constituent identifies the lowest and highest concentration detected during analysis. In all cases the ranges span from below the detection limits to above the MCLs. The detection limits all fell below MCL concentrations. During the RI

Metal Constituents	MCL (ug/L)	Range < DL- > MCL (ug/L)	Sites Greater than the MCL (Sites/Total Sites)	Samples Greater than the MCL (Samples/Total Samples)
Volatile Organic Compounds				
I, I-dichlorethene	7	OPI-100	81/9	10/35
1,2-dichloroethene (tot	al) 70	< DL-520 ¹	5/18	7/35
trichloroethene	Ś	< DL-5100 ¹	14/18	22/35
tetrachlorethene	S	<pre>COL-240</pre>	12/18	. 19/35
Metals	-			
arsenic	50	< DL-210	4/18	5/35
barium	2,000	<dl-3,740<sup>2</dl-3,740<sup>	3/18	3/35
chromium	50	< DL-1,240 ²	15/18	24/35
icad	15	<dl-1,000< td=""><td>15/18</td><td>25/35</td></dl-1,000<>	15/18	25/35
nickel	100	< DL-602 ²	10/18	12/35

Source: (1990 Law) and (1992 ES)

Notes:

- identified in an analysis at a secondary dilution factor ı
 - spiked sample recovery not within control limits - 01
- I
- less than the Detection Limits (Detection limits were less than the MCL) greater than the Maximum Contaminant Level micrograms per liter i > MCL ->DI
 - ī ug/L

TABLE 4.2

Frequency of Detection Above Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) 1989, 1990, and 1992

(

(1990 Law), 17 sites were tested and one site was tested during the pumping test (1992) for a total of 18 sites. The number of ground water sampling sites with contaminant detections above the MCLs is compared to the total number of ground water sampling sites in the study. A total of 35 analyses have been performed on these 18 sites between 1989 and 1992. The number of samples with contaminant levels above the MCLs is compared to the total number of to the total number of samples analyzed.

The most frequently detected volatile organic compound found above the MCL was trichloroethene (MCL is 5 ug/L). Trichloroethene was identified in 14 out of 18 sites. The detection limits ranged from less than the detection limit to 5,100 ug/L. Levels of trichloroethene above the MCLs were detected in 22 samples out of a total of 35 samples.

Tetrachloroethene (MCL 5 ug/L) was detected above the MCLs in 12 sites out of 18. Concentrations in the samples ranged from less than the detection limits to 240 ug/L. Levels of tetrachloroethene above the MCLs were detected in 19 out of 35 samples.

Chromium and lead were the two metals showing the highest frequency of detection, being present at 15 of the 18 sites sampled in Dunn Field. Chromium was found in 24 samples and lead was found in 25 samples out of 35 collected.

4.5 Risk Evaluation and Summary

An assessment of Dunn Field reveals a large number of constituents present in the ground water. The most frequently detected VOCs above the MCLs were trichloroethene and tetrachloroethene. Chromium and lead were the metals most frequently detected above the MCLs in 1989 and 1990, but were below MCLs in 1992. Another round of chemical sampling and analysis is needed to determine if metals should be included among the constituents of concern for Dunn Field ground water.

38 40

A potential public health risk is associated with the Fluvial Aquifer. This aquifer contains VOCs which could negatively impact the Memphis Sand Aquifer, the potable drinking source for 610,000 people. Further investigation is needed to establish the extent of ground water contamination at and near Dunn Field. Nevertheless, leakage through the confining unit into the Memphis Sand Aquifer can potentially occur in areas not yet identified.

5.0 REMEDIAL RESPONSE OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA

The remedial response objectives at Dunn Field have been established, based on the nature and extent of the contamination, the receptors that are potentially threatened, and the potential for human and environmental exposures. The following is a list of response objectives for ground water at Dunn Field:

- 1. Prevent exposure to currently contaminated ground water (Fluvial Aquifer),
- 2. Protect the lower aquifer (Memphis Sand) from contamination,
- 3. Reduce contaminant migration from beneath Dunn Field to off-site areas,
- 4. Satisfy the on-going requirements of the DDRC's RCRA Permit.

Response objectives are formulated based on the goal of the Superfund program to protect public health and the environment by either (1) restoring potentially usable contaminated ground water to levels that are safe for present and potential users and/or environmental receptors, or (2) preventing exposure to ground water contaminated above health-based levels. The preference of the Superfund program is to restore and protect usable ground water. The following sections discuss the objectives and criteria for an interim remedial measure at Dunn Field.

5.1 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

Section 121 (d) of CERCLA requires the selection of a remedial action that is protective of human health and the environment. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) approach to determining protectiveness involves a two tiered approach: 1) protectiveness based on Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) and 2) protectiveness using risk calculations that develop concentration limits based on the carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic effects of specific chemicals under given exposure conditions.

An ARAR represents a minimum standard or an action level/cleanup value that a remedy must attain. When ARARs do not exist or are questionable, risk-based

calculations should be developed in accordance with the USEPA guidance document *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I: Human Health Evaluation Manual,* December 1989, EPA 540/1-89/002. The calculated value(s) will then represent the action level for the contaminant(s) of concern.

5.1.1 <u>Types of ARARs</u>

The USEPA has grouped ARARs into Chemical-Specific, Action-Specific, and Location-Specific classifications. These three classifications are defined below:

- Chemical-Specific ARARs are usually health or risk-based numerical values or methodologies which, when applied to site-specific conditions, result in the establishment of numerical values. These values establish the acceptable amount or concentration of a chemical that may be found in, or discharged to, the ambient environment.
- Action-Specific ARARs are usually technology or activity-based requirements or limitations on actions taken with respect to hazardous wastes.
- Location-Specific ARARs are restrictions placed on the concentration of hazardous substances or the performance of activities solely because they occur in special locations.

The following sections present a preliminary list of the Chemical-Specific, Action-Specific, and Location-Specific ARARs that may apply to Dunn Field.

Chemical-Specific ARARs/Ground Water Media

For cleaning up ground water that may be used for drinking, 40 CFR Section 300.430 of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) states that maximum contaminant level goals (MCLGs), established under the Safe Drinking Water Act, that are set at concentrations above zero shall be attained if relevant and appropriate to the circumstances of the release. Where the MCLGs for a contaminant has been set at a concentration of zero, the Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) promulgated for that contaminant under the Safe Drinking Water Act shall be attained. MCLGs and MCLs are relevant and appropriate as cleanup levels for ground water that

is a current or potential source of drinking water. If a MCLG or MCL value has not been developed for the contaminant(s) of concern, then the ground water standards promulgated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) 40 CFR 264.94 shall be attained if relevant and appropriate to the circumstances of the release. The only exception to the approach described above is that the cleanup value for lead in ground water used for drinking is not its MCL. In an USEPA memorandum dated 21 June 1990, from Henry Longest, Director of the Office of Enforcement and Remedial Response (OERR) to Patrick Tobin, Director of Waste Management Division Region IV, Mr. Longest recommended a final action level for lead of 15 parts per billion. The MCLs and the MCLGs for the potential contaminants of concern were presented in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 in Chapter 4.0.

Action-Specific ARARs/Ground Water Media

ſ

The remediation of ground water using pumping and treatment techniques would require the discharge of the treated water to surface waters or to a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) or into the same formation from which it was withdrawn.

Both on-site and off-site discharges from CERCLA sites to surface waters are required to meet the substantive requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program (NPDES). These substantive requirements include discharge limitations (both technology and water quality based), certain monitoring requirements, and best management practices. These requirements will be contained in an NPDES permit for off-site discharges. For an on-site discharge from a CERCLA site, these substantive requirements must be identified and complied with if the discharge passes off-site. If the preferred alternative involves only an on-site, direct discharge, only substantive NPDES requirements would apply to the action.

The discharge of CERCLA wastewater to POTWs is considered an off-site activity. Therefore, CERCLA responses are required to comply with all applicable (both

substantive and administrative) requirements of the national pretreatment program, including the general and specific discharge prohibitions. Further, all local pretreatment regulations must be complied with before discharging wastewater to a POTW.

The operation and construction of Class IV wells, as defined in the Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program is prohibited, unless the wells are used to reinject treated ground water into the same formation from which it was withdrawn as part of a CERCLA cleanup or a RCRA corrective action (40 CFR 144.13(d)). The UIC program defines Class IV wells as those used to inject hazardous waste or radioactive waste into or above a formation, that within one-quarter (1/4) mile of the well, contains an underground drinking water source.

Underground injection wells that are constructed off-site are subject to all provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act relating to underground injection of fluids and must be permitted by an authorized state agency or EPA and comply with the UIC permit requirements. Superfund sites that construct underground injection wells on-site are not required to comply with the administrative requirements of the UIC program, however, they must meet the substantive requirements of this program where the requirement is determined to be applicable or relevant and appropriate to the CERCLA remedial action.

Location-Specific ARARS/Ground Water Media

The Memphis-Shelby County Groundwater Quality Control Board prohibits the operation of injection wells which introduce ground water or chemically or thermally altered water into underground formations. A variance to this regulation would be required to allow reinjection of treated water from the Fluvial Aquifer if this disposal strategy is selected at Dunn Field.

~

Chemical-Specific ARARS/Air Media

The VOCs that are contaminants of concern in the ground water beneath Dunn Field can react with sunlight and contribute to the formation of ozone in the lower levels of the atmosphere. These type of compounds are known as ozone precursors. Memphis-Shelby County is a non-attainment area for ozone, since ozone has been periodically found above federal guidelines for ambient air. Ozone is regulated under the Clean Air Act (CAA) in accordance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EPA is currently reviewing an application to redesignate Memphis-Shelby County as an attainment area for ozone. Air program requirements that are a part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) under the CAA are considered potential ARARS. The Memphis-Shelby County Air Pollution Control Guidelines are specified in Section 1200-3-18-.02 (see Appendix B).

The use of air stripping techniques to remove VOCs from ground water will cause the on-site emission of VOCs into the atmosphere. Under CERCLA and in accordance with OSWER Directive 9355.7-03 (Appendix G), this on-site emission is required to meet only the substantive requirements of state and local authorities. Requirements related to attainment of NAAQS are ARARS only when the remedial activity at a CERCLA site is a "major" source of emissions. A CERCLA site in Memphis-Shelby County would not be considered a "major" source unless its emissions exceeded 100 tons per year of ozone precursors in a non-attainment area for ozone. If Memphis-Shelby County were designated an attainment area for ozone, a CERCLA site would not be considered a major source unless it emitted more than 250 tons per year (August 1989 U.S. EPA).

Hazardous air pollutants are regulated under the Clean Air Act in accordance with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs). Discussions with Memphis Shelby County Air Pollution Control have indicated that the State of Tennessee Air Pollution Code Section 16-81 Reference 1200-3-11 for the emission of

Toxic Air Pollutants has been adopted by Memphis-Shelby County. The toxic air pollutants referenced are potential chemical specific ARARs (Appendix A).

The toxic air pollutants that are referenced in the Code are substances that have not been identified in the ground water at Dunn Field. Therefore, the remediation of ground water by pumping and treatment technology would not generate emissions of the Toxic Air Pollutants regulated under the CAA in accordance with the NESHAPs.

Location-Specific ARARs/Air Media

The Memphis/Shelby County Health Department has adopted the State of Tennessee Air Code. Ozone, carbon monoxide and lead air pollutants for Memphis/Shelby County has been designated a nonattainment area by EPA Region IV. EPA is currently reviewing applications (carbon monoxide application was submitted in October 1992, ozone application was submitted in November 1992) to redesignate Memphis-Shelby County as an attainment area for ozone and carbon monoxide. The initial information was documented in a letter dated 5 February 1991 sent by the Regional Administrator, Greer C. Tidwell, EPA Region IV to the Governor of Tennessee, Ned McWherter. A copy of this letter is presented in Appendix C.

Action-Specific ARARs/ Air Media

There are no current activity-based air requirements or limitations for air stripper technology or UV/oxidation technology with respect to air constituents. Under the New Source Performance Standards of the CAA, selected action-specific ARARs have been determined only for incineration technology, statutory gas turbines and storage of petroleum liquids (August 1989 U.S. EPA).

Location-Specific ARARS/Natural Resources

Preliminary discussions with the Tennessee Department of Conservation, Division of Solid Waste Management, has indicated that the state is not aware of any natural

- -

resources for which they act as a trustee which are potentially threatened or damaged as a result of past waste disposal practices in Dunn Field. Furthermore, the RI/FS (1990 Law) stated that no federal natural resources are located near the site. However, this will need to be confirmed with the U.S. Department of the Interior.

5.2 Ground Water Cleanup Goals

Water supply systems in the Memphis area depend heavily on ground water resources. The uppermost aquifer beneath Dunn Field is the Fluvial Aquifer. During the RI study (1990 Law), VOCs and metals were detected in the Fluvial Aquifer beneath Dunn Field at levels exceeding the federal drinking water standards. The same VOCs were present in the pump test well (fluvial aquifer) at levels above federal standards (1992 ES). However, metals observed above federal standards in 1990 were found at much lower concentrations in the 1992 pump test. Since different monitoring points were sampled from the fluvial aquifer during the two periods, another round of sampling is needed to establish if cleanup goals are needed for metals.

Beneath the Fluvial Aquifer lies the Memphis Sand Aquifer, which is heavily used for municipal water supplies. This aquifer provides about 200 million gallons per day to Memphis and the surrounding unincorporated area. Two monitoring wells at DDRC extend into the Memphis Sand, and with the exception on acetone (which is not a constituent of concern), did not exhibit VOC or metals contamination.

In response to chemical and action-specific ARARS in Dunn Field, the technologies which could be used to mitigate ground water must meet the substantive requirements. Groundwater Cleanup Levels need to be defined and groundwater treatment systems must comply with air emission requirements and the Clean Water Act.

The Groundwater Cleanup Levels (GCLs) define the contaminant concentration levels allowed to remain in the ground water. The purpose of the CERCLA Early Interim Remedial Measure is to reduce the current or potential risk to public health and/or the environment. Therefore, firm cleanup levels need not be established at the time of the interim measure in Dunn Field. Tentative cleanup goals should be established. These cleanup goals will be finalized at a later date through the CERCLA Record Of Decision processes.

Tentative Cleanup Goals can be established to define the contaminant concentration levels allowed to remain in the ground water. The federal Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) will be substituted for the Tentative Cleanup Goals (TCGs). The MCLs will be enforced until the CERCLA ROD process is finalized and Groundwater Cleanup Levels (GCL) have been defined. A list of the TCGs, MCLs and Tennessee guidelines for the contaminants of concern is presented in Table 5.1.

5.3 Air Emission Requirements for Ground Water Treatment

Air emission requirements for ground water treatment systems at Dunn Field must comply with the administrative requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA), action and chemical-specific ARARs, and Memphis/Shelby County Health Department Air Code regulations.

At the present time, the status of ozone and carbon monoxide air pollutants in Memphis/Shelby County is under review. EPA Region IV is currently reviewing documents (sent by the State of Tennessee on October 1992) for redesignation of Shelby/Memphis County from a nonattainment area to an attainment area for carbon monoxide. In November of 1992, documents were sent to EPA Region IV seeking redesignation of Shelby/Memphis County from a nonattainment area to an attainment area to an attainment area for ozone. At the present time, Memphis/Shelby County is still designated a nonattainment area for lead air pollutants.

11

Tennessee Guidelines (ug/L)	7 7 2 2 2 2	50 2,000 50 100
Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) (ug/L)	20 2 2	50 2,000 50 100
Tentative Cleanup Goals (TCGs) (ug/L)	70 70 5	50 2,000 15 100
Constituent	 <u>Volatile Organic Compounds</u> 1, 1-dichloroethene dichloroethene (total) trichloroethene tetrachloroethene 	<u>Metals</u> arsenic barium chromium tead nickel

5-9

TABLE 5.1

.

-

ţ

`#

Tentative Cleanup Goals Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water DDRC - Dunn Field

Source: ES, 1993.

ug/L - micrograms per liter

38 50

Emission requirements for ground water treatment systems are handled on an individual basis since emission standards for VOCs have not been defined. The Memphis/Shelby County Health Department has an administrative requirement for a construction-operating permit (Chapter 1200-3-9) before the system goes into operation. Each construction-operating permit is based on the "Best Available Control Technology" (BACT).

6.0 IDENTIFICATION OF TECHNOLOGIES

An interim treatment system controlling contaminant migration in ground water at Dunn Field will have three components: extraction, treatment, and disposal. Several viable technologies and process options are capable of accomplishing these functions. These technologies and process options will be screened to determine which are suitable for further evaluation as part of a treatment alternative.

6.1 Ground Water Extraction

The initial phase in selecting a ground water treatment system is to determine whether it is necessary to bring the water to the surface for treatment or if treatment can take place in-situ. If the ground water is to be brought to the surface, it can be extracted by means of trenches or wells. For an extraction system to be considered viable, it must be able to control migration, be a proven technology, be able to be permitted, and must not be cost prohibitive.

6.1.1 Interceptor Trenches

Trenches, open or buried, may be used for intercepting ground water flow to contain a contaminant plume. Interceptor trenches are primarily used in situations involving shallow ground water due to their low operating costs and efficiency at ground water extraction.

Open trenches require excavation into the aquifer where the ground water flow can be collected. The use of open trenches is limited to very shallow aquifers where an open ditch would not create an undo safety or excavation problem. Buried trenches work on the same principle by creating a zone of high permeability which intercepts ground water and diverts its flow to a collection point. Excavation is still required to the aquifer where a slotted or perforated collection pipe can be buried in highly permeable backfill. The buried trench then acts as a drain which intercepts and/or contains further ground water flow away from a site. The effect of a trench extraction system can be

6 1

enhanced by installing a highly impermeable barrier on the down gradient side of the trench. This would allow capture of only the ground water flow up gradient of the trench.

The depth to the Fluvial Aquifer at Dunn Field is approximately 60 feet. Trenches of this depth are extremely difficult and costly to construct in a safe manner. Therefore, trenches will not be considered further in selecting alternatives to control ground water migration from Dunn Field.

6.1.2 <u>Wells</u>

Another means of ground water extraction is from wells. Ground water extraction from wells can utilize two systems: well points or pumping wells.

Well points are typically small in diameter, grouped closely together, and are relatively shallow. In a well point system, the wells are connected to a common header pipe and suction pump. Since a suction or vacuum pump can generally only achieve a lift of less than 22 feet, well point systems are suited for ground water extraction in very shallow aquifers or in stratified soil. For the most effective drawdown and ground water containment, the extraction wells in Dunn Field must penetrate the top of the Fluvial Aquifer which is about 60 feet below the surface. Therefore, well point technology is not feasible for application in Dunn Field.

Pumping well systems provide greater flexibility than well points since the wells can be installed at any depth and spacing. Pumping wells are 4 to 12 inches in diameter to accommodate a submersible pump which lifts ground water to the surface. The pump selection is a key component of the pumping well to achieve the desired operating conditions. Installation costs are higher due to the larger size and greater depth of pumping wells. Spacing of the wells is dependent upon the anticipated drawdown and distance-drawdown in the aquifer. Over lapping of capture zones can effectively intercept a plume which is wider than the capture zone of one well.

Pumping wells can be configured in a variety of ways to assist in controlling contaminant migration in an aquifer. The wells can be placed on the down gradient perimeter of the plume to intercept and extract contaminants to prevent their migration. The wells can also be placed near the center of the plume to extract all contaminated ground water flowing down gradient from the source and reverse the flow of the contaminants already down gradient from the well.

There are additional techniques that can be used with pumping wells to increase their effectiveness in preventing ground water migration. Slurry walls can be used to create a physical barrier either down gradient to prevent further migration or up gradient to prevent ground water flow beneath the source of contamination. Reinjection of treated ground water can be used down gradient of the contaminant plume to accelerate ground water flow back toward the extraction wells. Reinjection wells installed up gradient of the plume can assist by accelerating ground water toward the extraction wells. These techniques can supplement the effectiveness of pumping wells in controlling contamination migration.

For the purposes of this Interim Remedial Measure to control ground water migration from Dunn Field, pumping wells will be retained for further consideration as a component of an alternative. At this time there is not sufficient data available to determine the location of the down gradient edge of the plume. Therefore, neither pumping wells nor reinjection wells placed down gradient of the plume will be considered. The use of deep wells within the plume and reinjection wells up gradient of the plume will be retained for further consideration as components of alternatives. Physical barriers will not be considered further since the location of the sources and the extent of the plume is unknown.

38 54

6.2

6.2 Treatment

Contaminants in ground water must be removed or destroyed before the water can be safely released into the environment. The RI/FS (1990 Law) found elevated levels of VOCs and metals in the ground water at Dunn Field. Samples taken during the pumping test (1992 ES) contained only VOCs above action levels. Therefore, a system for treating ground water in the Fluvial Aquifer at Dunn Field must reduce VOCs and may need to remove metals depending upon another round of confirmatory sampling.

Treatment processes for liquid wastes fall into three broad categories: physical treatment, chemical treatment and biological treatment. All of these treatment processes could be utilized individually or in combination at Dunn Field to effectively treat ground water contaminated with VOCs. Some of these processes can be carried out *insitu* without having to extract the ground water.

6.2.1 <u>In-situ Treatment</u>

In-situ treatment of the ground water would employ the use of physical, chemical or biological technologies to degrade, immobilize or remove the contaminants. Current technologies for *in-situ* treatment of ground water contaminants include bioremediation, chemical immobilization, chemical mobilization, chemical detoxification, and vapor extraction. Elements of *in-situ* treatment which must be addressed include methods of delivering treatment reagents to the subsurface and methods for containing the spread of contaminants and reagents beyond the treatment zone.

In-Situ Bioremediation - Bioremediation is a process that uses the soil's naturally occurring microorganisms to decompose toxic or hazardous organic compounds. Successful *in-situ* bioremediation has been performed on contaminated soils and ground water through stimulation of indigenous organisms by the addition of oxygen and nutrients.

. .

Implementation of bioremediation technology is controlled by the specific contaminants and the hydrogeologic conditions. To evaluate a site's suitability for bioremediation would require thorough site characterization, laboratory treatability studies, and a bench-scale study.

The characterization would include an assessment of the organic and inorganic chemicals present, the disposition of the waste, indigenous microbial activity, toxicity, and soil and ground water chemistry. Chlorinated solvents such as those present in the ground water at Dunn Field are not readily biodegradable using in-situ techniques. The concentration of metals present in the ground water would not be reduced by bioremediation. The limited knowledge of the extent and characteristics of the zone of contamination around Dunn Field further restrict the development of bioremediation as an interim treatment technology. The hydrogeological conditions dictate the method for delivery of treatment reagents to the subsurface and methods of controlling the spread of contaminants and reagents beyond the treatment zone.

Laboratory treatability studies would be required to confirm the viability of biological treatment and to identify the conditions required to stimulate the available biomass. Next, a bench-scale study, including a complete material balance, would be used to determine the fate of contaminants and define the process in greater detail. The intermediate products of microbial metabolism may sometimes result in compounds which are more hazardous than the original contaminant. The time necessary to perform these analyses has adverse effects on the expeditious establishment of an interim treatment system.

In-Situ Chemical Immobilization - Immobilization processes are designed to stabilize or solidify the contaminant thereby reducing the waste's solubility, toxicity, or mobility. Most stabilization and solidification processes involve the addition of materials to the waste which, in the case of the ground water at Dunn Field, would require numerous

injection wells. The resulting immobilized contaminants would remain in place beneath Dunn Field. Most stabilization and solidification technologies are effective on inorganics and metals but have limited application for organic compounds which are of primary concern at Dunn Field.

In-situ vitrification, the process of heating the contaminated soil area until it becomes a molten solid has shown success at immobilizing organic contaminants. Implementation of the *in-situ* vitrification process would vaporize the ground water or would require numerous wells in draw down the ground water in the aquifer.

The large size of the potential area of contamination and the relatively dilute concentrations of the wastes would result in prohibitive costs if *in-situ* immobilization technologies were to be used. Stabilization and solidification would be more effective options for treating relatively small, defined "hot spots" of contaminated soil. Therefore, stabilization and solidification will not be considered further as treatment technologies for the contaminated ground water at Dunn Field.

In-Situ Chemical Mobilization - Chemical mobilization, or "soil flushing", is the process of applying a liquid agent to the contaminated soil which renders specific contaminants soluble. The mobilized aqueous contaminants can then be removed from the ground for treatment. This technology has been effective at removing organic, inorganic, and metal contaminants. Most applications of chemical mobilization require that the contaminated soil be excavated. Since excavation is not desirable at Dunn Field *in-situ* chemical mobilization will not be considered further as a treatment technology. Use of chemical mobilization may have merit at Dunn Field if combined with a pump and treat alternative to make the contaminants more soluble for transport to the surface for treatment.

In-Situ Detoxification - Detoxification technologies utilize the chemical reactions of hydrolysis, oxidation/reduction, and neutralization to transform contaminants to a less toxic state. *In-situ* detoxification would require the addition of reagents to initiate the desired chemical reaction. Certain metals are the only compounds which detoxification would be an effective treatment technology. Due to the variety of contaminants, particularly organic compounds, present in the ground water at Dunn Field, this technology will not be considered further.

In-Situ Vapor Extraction - Vapor extraction is a proven *in-situ* process for removing volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds from the unsaturated zone of soil. Vacuum pumps or blowers are used to induce an air flow through the soil. The volatile organic compounds are desorbed from the ground water and soil into the air stream. A trench or network of extraction wells is constructed to collect the air for treatment on the surface before release into the atmosphere.

Vapor extraction is an effective means to remediate a site once the source of contamination has been removed and the extent of the contaminant plume has been defined. Neither condition has been accomplished at Dunn Field. The primary media which vapor extraction affects is soil. The ground water is approximately 60 feet below the surface at Dunn Field. Soil vapor extraction would have limited effect at remediating the ground water at this depth. For these reasons, in-situ vapor extraction will not be considered as a ground water treatment technology at Dunn Field.

6.2.2 Activated Carbon Adsorption for VOCs Removal

Activated carbon adsorption is a chemical process of collecting soluble substances onto the surface of activated carbon. Treatment of water containing VOCs can be accomplished by passing the water through a single or series of activated carbon packed bed reactors. As the water comes in contact with the activated carbon, VOCs are attracted to the surface of the carbon particles.

6-7

A typical carbon system uses granular activated carbon in a series of downflow reactor vessels. The size of the reactors and flow rate through the reactors must be designed to achieving sufficient contact time for the VOCs to adsorb to the carbon. In addition to contact time, the effectiveness of carbon adsorption depends on the available surface area of carbon and the strength of the molecular attraction between the carbon and VOCs. As the carbon continues to adsorb VOCs, the strength of the attraction to the carbon granules decreases. Periodic monitoring will indicate when the adsorptive capacity has lost its effectiveness and the carbon is categorized as spent.

To optimize performance of activated carbon water treatment, the suspended solids concentration in the water must be low. Suspended solids, which might otherwise get caught in the carbon bed, should be removed prior to contact with the activated carbon. Suspended solids can usually be removed by physical means such as sedimentation or filtration. Ground water tested following 42 hours of extraction from the pump test well in Dunn Field in September 1992 contained a suspended solids concentration of 1 mg/L (1992 ES).

Economical application of carbon treatment depends on an efficient means of regenerating the carbon after its adsorptive capacity has been reached. Venders of carbon treatment units offer regeneration services. Carbon can be regenerated on site using an incinerator to oxidize the organic matter to remove it from the carbon surface. In addition to the operating costs of on site incineration, air emission permits would also be required. Each regeneration destroys about 5 to 10 percent of the carbon, and regenerated carbon has less adsorptive capacity than virgin carbon. Spent carbon which is not regenerated would require disposal as a hazardous waste.

For the long duration and large quantity of ground water to be treated during this Interim Remedial Measure, regeneration will be necessary. Using activated carbon as

É.

۶.۹

the primary means of ground water treatment demand the expensive operation and maintenance of a carbon adsorption and regeneration system at Dunn Field. Therefore this technology will be retained as a possible component of a treatment alternative.

6.2.3 <u>Air Stripping for VOCs Removal</u>

Air stripping is a physical process of mixing water contaminated with volatile organics with clean air. The intimate contact of the water and air cause a mass transfer of the volatile organics from the liquid to the gaseous phase. Two categories of air stripping processes are used: dispersing air in liquid or dispersing liquid in air.

Air stripping which puts air through liquid typically involves bubbling or mixing air through a volume of stored water. This requires an air compressor or drive motors to generate pressured air or turbulent mixing thus requiring a great deal of energy.

The more frequently used air stripping systems disperse liquid through air. Typical air stripping devices in this category include packed tower aerators, redwood slat aerators, cooling towers, and spray towers. These systems create water droplets or a water film to facilitate mass transfer as the water passes countercurrent to the air.

Packed towers with ceramic, plastic or glass media are the most common air stripping devices. The contaminated water enters at the top of the tower and trickles down across the media thus encouraging contact with air. Air is forced upward using an air blower. The volatile organics transfer to the gaseous phase and are exhausted with the air out the top of the tower. The air to water ratio required is generally less than 100 to 1. A properly designed and operated air stripping tower typically achieves 99 percent removal of volatile organics in the water effluent.

For most efficient operation, water being treated by air stripping should be low in suspended solids. During the pump test in Dunn Field in September 1992, the extracted water contained approximately 1 mg/L suspended solids, which would easily pass

60

6-9

thorugh an air stripping system without affecting its operation. Therefore filtration of the extracted water prior to air stripping would not be required.

A typical packed tower will be 3 to 10 feet in diameter depending on the flow rate desired and 10 to 30 feet in height depending on the level of cleanup required. Towers are generally readily available and can be obtained as mobile units. Operation is relatively simple and maintenance costs are low making air stripping a technology which would be well suited for use at Dunn Field.

Since volatile organics would be released to the atmosphere, air emission requirements would be a factor in the design and operation of an air stripping tower. Carbon adsorption, as described above, is an effective means of capturing the volatile organics from an air stream. The air flow from the air stripper would be conveyed to an activated carbon system for removal of the VOCs. This system would consist of two tanks, operating in series, that would be exchanged when the first tank becomes saturated with VOCs. Spent carbon would either be transported off-site for disposal or regeneration, or regenerated on-site using a thermal treatment system. On-site regeneration would only be practical if enough VOCs were produced to make this economically justified. A properly designed and operating activated carbon scrubber can achieve greater than 99 percent removal of volatile organic compounds from air. This effective VOC reduction should meet all ambient air quality requirements.

Air stripping using a packed tower and an optional activated carbon adsorption air scrubber will be retained and incorporated into an alternative for treatment of extracted ground water from Dunn Field.

6.2.4 <u>UV/Oxidation for VOCs Removal</u>

Oxidation is a chemical process which can be used to destroy organic contaminants. Recent developments in oxidation technologies, known as advanced oxidation processes,

have demonstrated success at treating VOC contaminated waters. Ozone and hydrogen peroxide are commonly used as oxidizing agents. Radiation from ultraviolet (UV) light may be categorized as a catalyst to the oxidation process using ozone and/or hydrogen peroxide.

ULTROX International has developed process which uses UV light plus ozone and/or hydrogen peroxide. The process was demonstrated to the USEPA as part of a Superfund Innovation Technology Evaluation study in 1989. The ULTROX process was proven to be an effective means of treating ground water contaminated with VOCs to below detectable levels.

The ULTROX treatment system consists of the following major components: a UV/oxidation reactor, an air compressor/ozone generator module, a hydrogen peroxide feed system and a catalytic ozone decomposition unit. Low intensity UV lamps, also known as mercury vapor lamps, are used to produce the UV radiation. The hydrogen peroxide is mixed with the wastewater stream which flows through the reactor at a predetermined hydraulic detention time for adequate exposure to the UV light. Ozone is transferred to the contaminated water forming hydroxyl radicals which are powerful chemical oxidants capable of breaking down a wide variety of organic contaminants. When carried to completion, the end products of such a process are carbon dioxide, water and chlorine. Ozone which is not fully transferred to the atmosphere.

The primary appeal of UV/oxidation over the other treatment processes is that it provides final treatment. There is no residuals or contaminant release into the air which would require additional treatment. The primary concerns with this system is safe handling of the priority pollutant, ozone, and susceptibility of the UV lamps to fouling which diminishes their effectiveness. As cases of successful use of UV/oxidation continue to rise, these concerns are diminishing.

6 11

Treatability studies would be necessary before implementation on the ground water at Dunn Field. Since the technology is still relatively new, there would be a greater degree of technical expertise needed to oversee the operation of a UV/oxidation system. Both of these aspects contribute to the already higher cost of acquiring and operating a UV/oxidation treatment system. Vendors such as ULTROX International justify the higher cost over time by assuming that other treatment alternatives will require additional residual or air treatment.

Properly designed, UV/oxidation has proven to be a successful method of treating ground water contaminated with VOCs such as are present at Dunn Field. Therefore, UV/oxidation will be retained as an alternative for treatment of extracted ground water from Dunn Field.

6.2.5 Biological Treatment for VOCs Removal

Extracted ground water containing VOCs may be treated in biological treatment reactors. In most applications, aerobic biological treatment processes are used for removal of hazardous organic matter. Aerobic biological treatment reactors can be separated into two major categories: suspended-growth reactors and fixed-film reactors.

In suspended-growth reactors, bacterial growth occurs in the water, which is thoroughly mixed to promote oxygen transfer to the microbes for respiration. Oxygen and other macronutrients, such as nitrogen and phosphorus, are supplied in these reactors by mechanical means, such as air diffusers and chemical feeders. Examples of treatment operations which utilize suspended-growth reactors include activated sludge and aerated lagoon processes. A disadvantage of suspended-growth reactors is that due to the relatively long hydraulic detention time required, a large reactor size is required.

In fixed-film reactors, bacteria grow on an inert support medium. Contaminated water is distributed over the medium, allowing organic matter to contact and be consumed by

· · · ·

bacteria. Oxygen is supplied from the atmosphere or by forced air blowers. Macronutrients must be injected into the system. The two primary types of fixed-film reactors are trickling filters and rotating biological contactors. Because of their module construction and adaptability to flow and contaminant concentration variations, rotating biological contactors (RBC) would be best suited for implementation at Dunn Field.

A RBC consists of multiple plastic discs mounted on a horizontal shaft. The shaft, at a right angle to wastewater flow, rotates with about 40 percent of the total disc area submerged. The bioadsorption and bio-oxidation take place on the surface of the disc. To achieve higher contaminant removal, multiple RBC can be connected in series creating a longer hydraulic detention time but also requiring a larger designated treatment area. Microbial growth which sloughs off the RBC must be removed by final clarification in a settling tank. Sludge from this clarifier will require treatment or disposal in a hazardous water landfill. In cold climates, RBC must be covered since biological activity may be significantly reduced. Gas emissions may result which require monitoring and/or treatment before release into the atmosphere.

Laboratory treatability studies would be required to confirm the viability of biological treatment and to identify the conditions required to stimulate the biomass. Next, a bench-scale study, including a complete material balance, would be used to determine the fate of contaminants and define the process in greater detail.

The time necessary to perform these analyses has adverse effects on the expeditious establishment of an interim treatment system. Biological treatment is complicated by the sensitivity and expertise necessary to operate a properly functioning system. The requirement for a finishing step in water treatment, treatment and/or disposal of sludge, and monitoring and/or treatment of air emissions further increases the effort and expense to treat VOC contaminated ground water using biological means. Therefore,

38 64

 z + 2

38

biological treatment will not be retained for further consideration as a alternative for ground water treatment at Dunn Field.

6.2.6 <u>Precipitation for Metals Removal</u>

Precipitation is a treatment process for removing particulate or colloidal solids from water, and has been widely employed for many years. For metals present at part per billion or part per million concentrations in water, both particulate and dissolved forms of the metal can occur. Therefore, in order to precipitate metals as solids from water, and achieve the desired action levels, several steps would be required. First, pH adjustments are needed to convert dissolved forms of the metal into particulates. Flocculating agents would be added to the water to encourage coagulation of the particles and settling. The water would have to be contained in a basin which minimizes turbulence and promotes gravity settling, or passed through a filtration unit to remove the fine particles.

Precipitation produces a sludge that would require disposal at an off-site facility. This sludge would contain the metals removed from the ground water, and would likely have to be managed as a hazardous waste. The quantity of sludge depends upon the concentration of metal constituents in the water, the types and quantities of flocculating agents used, and on the extent that the sludge is dewatered prior to disposal.

Since the level of treatment of metals is limited by their solubility in water, a mixture of metals may not be treatable with a single pH adjustment. When that is the case, multistage pH adjustment and clarification are required. Polishing filters may be required where very stringent effluent requirements must be met. If precipitation is considered for Dunn Field, a treatability study should be performed to determine the optimum combination of processes and chemicals for removing metals to the desired levels. Precipitation and the associated processes appear to be feasible and could be installed in Dunn Field to accomplish the desired metals removal.

6.2.7 <u>Ion Exchange for Metals Removal</u>

Another process for removal of metals is ion exchange, which takes advantage of the ionic nature of metals. With ion exchange, water is passed through a synthetic resin, which attracts the metal ion and exchanges it for another innocuous ion, such as sodium.

Ion exchange resins are relatively insoluble granular materials that have acid or basic radicals exposed on parts of their surface. Because the number of exposed radicals depends upon the surface area of the resin, resins are available in a variety of particle sizes. There are many resins available, some of which are suited for classes of compounds and others of which are quite specific in the ions they capture. Thus to determine the capacity for removing a particular metal, both the type of resin and the size of granulation must be known. For wastewaters containing a mixture of metals, one or more resins may be required. In an application involving several metals and several resins, tanks of resin (or "beds") can be operated in series, each one containing a different resin or it may be feasible to combine multiple resins into one bed.

When the exchange sites in a resin are all used, the resin must be regenerated. Typically this process involves taking the bed out of service and introducing an acid or other agent to remove the ions from the resin and replenish the original ions. The regeneration solution is then drained from the bed and then either disposed or purified to remove the contaminants. In applying this process at Dunn Field, processing the regeneration solution is likely to be done more economically off-site.

Ion exchange appears feasible at Dunn Field, because the low dissolved solids (about 300 mg/L) in the ground water should not greatly compete for the resin's capacity. An ion exchange process in Dunn Field would require less land than precipitation/filtration, and may be more capable of consistently achieving the action levels for metals. As with precipitation, a treatability study should be performed to demonstrate that an ion

exchange process can successfully achieve the desired removal levels for metals in Dunn Field ground water.

6.2.8 Off-Site Treatment

An option to establishing and operating a facility at Dunn Field capable of treating the contaminated ground water would be to transport the water off-site for treatment.

Off-site treatment could be performed at an existing, permitted treatment facility already capable of treating and disposing of water with contaminants similar to those found in the ground water at Dunn Field. Most municipal wastewater treatment systems could not adequately remove VOCs. Thus a specialized industrial wastewater treatment facility would be needed to handle this ground water.

Transportation presents an insurmountable problem. Assuming 520 gpm of ground water is being extracted, and tank trucks equipped to haul 6,500 gallons, one trunk would be required every 12.5 minutes. To be effective, the ground water extraction system must operate 24 hours per day, year round. The intense dedication of tank trucks and sufficient drivers to accomplish this task is not feasible.

Therefore, off-site treatment of ground water from Dunn Field will not be considered further. Off-site treatment and/or disposal of residuals produced from other treatment systems may be incorporated into an alternative for ground water treatment at Dunn Field.

6.3 Disposal

Following extraction and treatment of the contaminated ground water, an appropriate remedial action alternative must identify an approved method of disposing or releasing the water. The disposal route is a critical factor since the method of discharge may determine the ground water clean up levels and associated permits which will be required.

The following discharge routes will be considered: discharge to a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW), discharge to surface storm water drainage system, or reinjection of the water back into the ground via wells or infiltration. For a disposal route to be considered viable, it must be able to handle the flow rate, be able to be permitted, and must not be cost prohibitive.

6.3.1 Discharge to POTW

The treated ground water could be discharged into the Memphis sanitary sewer system. Wastewater from the Dunn Field area is conveyed to the City of Memphis - South Waste Treatment Facility. Hydraulic capacity at this facility is available to handle treated ground water discharges from Dunn Field. The hydraulic capacity of sanitary sewers serving the Dunn Field area is not likely to accommodate the additional flow. Administrative requirements, in the form of a System Discharge Agreement (see Appendix D) would need to be met before this action could be implemented. The city would accept certain loadings of contaminants in the effluent based upon the types of constituents the POTW is equipped treat.

6.3.2 Discharge to Surface Drainage

The contaminated ground water could be sufficiently treated to meet substantive NPDES requirements and then discharged in close proximity to the site along the northern boundary of Dunn Field. A suitable surface drainage channel lies along the north boundary of Dunn Field which leads north to Cane Creek and thence to Nonconnah Creek. Section 121(e) of CERCLA exempts any response action conducted on-site from having to obtain a Federal, State, or local permit. Under the Clean Water Act, operation of the preferred alternative would be considered to be a "direct" discharge. By EPA definition, direct discharge of wastewater is considered to be on-site if the receiving water body is in the area of contamination or is in the very close proximity to the site and is necessary for implementation of the response action (even if the water

body flows off-site) (August, 1988 USEPA; August, 1989 USEPA; and OSWER Directive 9234.1-02). The NPDES permit that DDRC currently holds is for storm water only. DDRC would have to file a modified NPDES permit application to describe the additional discharge locations, the continuous discharge rate and required constituent levels for the on-site treatment system in order to solicit substantive ARARS. However, the administrative requirement for either a permit or permit-equivalent would not be applicable because this will be an on-site discharge in accordance with OSWER Directive 9355.7-03.

If this strategy were employed for disposal of treated water, the ability of the drainage system to accommodate the additional flow during both dry weather and wet weather would need to be considered. Furthermore, the added flow could potentially enhance scouring of stream banks and degrade down stream water quality. In addition, water in the channel could potentially infiltrate surrounding soils and, if contaminants are present in those soils, create leaching and added mobility of those contaminants toward ground water.

6.3.3 <u>Reinjection or Infiltration</u>

The treated water could be returned to the Fluvial Aquifer by reinjection or infiltration. The treated water could also be disposed of by injecting it into a deeper formation.

Reinjection - As previously discussed, the treated ground water could be reinjected into the Fluvial Aquifer in a manner which would help control contaminant migration. Reinjection down gradient of the contaminant plume could reverse the gradient in the ground water and accelerate the movement of contaminants back toward the extraction wells. Since the plume extent is not fully defined, this action could also accelerate the movement of contaminants away from Dunn Field. For this reason, reinjection down gradient will not be considered further.

Reinjection wells placed up gradient of the sources of contamination could assist in flushing the contaminants from beneath the burial zone but would not necessarily help control migration. Permitting of any reinjection system would be required and may create obstacles to implementation but upgradient reinjection will be retained as a disposal alternative.

 \mathbb{Z}^{2}

Infiltration - Treated water would be released onto the ground surface and allowed to saturate and then infiltrate through the soil into the Fluvial Aquifer. Used over the burial areas or up gradient from the burial areas, this method of discharge would aid in flushing the contaminants out of the soil and toward the extraction wells for treatment. However, moving the contaminants deeper into the soil and closer to the Fluvial aquifer will not contribute to a permanent solution. Therefore, infiltration in Dunn Field will not be considered further. Infiltration downgradient would require setting aside acreage to receive the treated water. Sufficient land area is not likely to be available nearby, and would pose conflicts with surrounding residential and institutional land uses. Therefore, infiltration downgradient will not be considered further as a means of disposal of treated ground water.

Deep Well Injection - Treated ground water could be injected into any of several aquifers beneath the site. The State of Tennessee has classified all of these aquifers for drinking water or injection purposes. The Memphis Sand Aquifer beneath Dunn Field is set aside for drinking water, and the other aquifers are not suited for reinjection. The only deep aquifer available for injection in the state is near central Tennessee. Due to the problems of logistics and high transportation costs, deep well injection will not be considered further as a means of disposal of treated ground water.

SL016.23/SEC6-ER/ERDRFI/August 19, 1993 6-19

:

ł

6.4 Screened Technologies

The technologies and their process options which have been reviewed are summarized in Table 6.1. Those which have been retained for consideration as part of an extraction, treatment, and disposal alternative are noted.
TABLE 6.1

38 72

Technologies Screened and Retained for Consideration at Dunn Field

Function	Technology	Process Option	Retained
In-Situ	Physical or Chemical Processes	Bioremediation Chemical Immobilization Vitrification Chemical Mobilization Detoxification Vapor Extraction	
Extraction	Interceptor Trenches		
	Wells	Well Points Pumping Well Pumping Well with Reinjection	x x
Treatment	Activated Carbon Adsorption		
	Air Stripping	No Emission Treatment Emission Treatment	x x
	UV/Oxidation		x
	Biological Treatment	Suspended Growth Fixed Film	
	Off-Site Treatment		
	Precipitation		x
	Ion Exchange	•	x
Disposal	POTW		х
	Surface Water Discharge		x
	Reinjection	Down Gradient Upgradient Infiltration Deep Aquifer	x

11

÷. •

1. - ¹

ſ.".

7.0 HYDROGEOLOGIC IMPACTS

7.1 Introduction

The conceptual design of a system to control contaminated ground water in the Dunn Field vicinity of DDRC can be efficiently performed using mathematical models. Ground water models are available offering a range of complexity and sophistication. Simple analytical models are available to make an idealized analysis of flow and drawdown. Semi-analytical and numerical models can be used for more sophisticated evaluations, such as to account for spatial variations of soils, other 3-dimensional factors, or chemical transport effects.

The objectives of modeling the Fluvial Aquifer beneath Dunn Field are to evaluate flow control created by various patterns of extraction wells. Data to be used in this analysis was developed during the RI/FS (1990 Law), along with data from the pump test conducted in Dunn Field (1992 ES). Other data gathered by previous studies has also been used in planning this evaluation. While there are limitations to this data which may prevent the application of sophisticated models, nevertheless the use of models is appropriate to evaluate and compare different scenarios.

The models to be considered here are suited for simulating the hydraulic behavior of aquifers. More complex models which simulate both the hydraulic behavior and chemical transport are limited by the lack of site-specific data to calibrate them. Therefore a key assumption in the modeling is that the contaminants move through the aquifer like the water does. This is a good approximation for a conceptual design at Dunn Field, since the fluvial aquifer is only 15 to 20 feet thick and can be modelled as a two-dimensional system. Furthermore, since extraction wells would be screened across the entire aquifer thickness, these wells would be suitable of capturing a variety of contaminants regardless of density or other physical properties. This assumption is appropriate for the constituents of concern in Dunn Field, which include VOCs and potentially metals.

7.2 Selection of Model

Two ground water models, MODFLOW and DREAM, were considered for use in evaluating ground water control scenarios. The first model considered was MODFLOW, a numerical model developed at the U.S. Geological Survey for modeling aquifer responses to various stresses. MODFLOW allows use of combinations of different modules (specification of grid size, well placement, and recharge) and boundary conditions, such as active or inactive areas. The combination of modules and the resulting output are expressed in numerical terms that approximate the responses of actual aquifers to pumping, reinjection, or other stresses. The output from MODFLOW is expressed as changes in head and calculation of water budget.

An effort was made to calibrate MODFLOW to the Dunn Field environment. The conceptual model of the Fluvial Aquifer was an unconfined sandy layer underlain by an impermeable clay. General ground water flow was to the west with a gradient of 0.01 to 0.02 feet per foot. This conceptual model was expressed as a one-layer grid of varying cell sizes that increased in all directions away from Dunn Field. Input consisted of known and inferred ground water elevations from September 1992 and elevations of the aquifer bottom.

Prior to evaluating response to stress, a numerical model should produce steady-state conditions with no stress on the system, followed by calibration of the model to known stress such as a pumping test. However, applying MODFLOW to the Fluvial Aquifer did not achieve the known steady-state conditions of measured ground water elevations and a constant water budget. To test the steady-state conditions, the input from inferred ground water elevations east, west, and north of Dunn Field were varied, as were the inferred aquifer bottom elevations. The model grid size and cell variability were also changed in different simulations so as to best approximate steady-state conditions. The

general responses of the model to steady-state simulations were as follows:

- Modeling a small grid of 1200 feet by 1200 feet produced dewatering of cells, a situation not known to exist in the Fluvial Aquifer.
- Modeling with larger grids of 3400 by 4800 feet and 6200 by 7000 feet produced an unbalanced water budget and rising (rather than stead-state) ground water elevations across the site. Changes in cell variability and boundary conditions did not significantly alter these results.

The problems with a MODFLOW steady-state simulation of the site were not resolved. The lack of hydrogeological data north and east of Dunn Field may have hindered model calibration, particularly if this area exhibits geological features or water tables different from what has been observed to date. Without steady state conditions satisfied, calibration simulations and testing of extraction well scenarios cannot give valid results.

An analytical model program (DREAM) was then considered to represent extraction scenarios at Dunn Field. This program was developed at the University of Oregon (1990 Bonn and Rounds) and uses basic ground water-related equations to predict the effects of stresses on ground water systems. Within stated limitations, this program can be used an estimate of ground water flow conditions and an analytical tool for evaluation of pumping and injection systems. It does not replace the precision and accuracy possible with numerical modeling programs, but it does provide a working estimate of the result of stress on simple ground water systems and has been used with a variety of ground water flow problems. DREAM was thus selected for evaluation of pumping scenarios at DDRC.

DREAM calculates drawdowns, water level elevations, steady-state velocities, and steady-state streamlines. The transient drawdown and water levels are calculated using the Theis equation. The Theis equation describes unsteady, radial flow to a well

completed in a confined aquifer. The basic assumptions for the model are the same ones which apply to the Theis equation. These include:

- The aquifer is homogeneous, isotropic, confined, of uniform thickness, and of infinite areal extent.
- Before pumping, the piezometric surface is horizontal. The well is pumped at a constant rate.
- The pumped well penetrates the entire aquifer, and flow to the well is horizontal.
- Flow to the well is laminar.

ſ

- The well diameter is infinitesimal so that storage in the well can be neglected.
- Water removed from storage is discharged instantaneously with decline in head.

The values of the stream function are calculated using a complex velocity potential (1985 Granger) which is defined only for steady-state systems.

The DREAM model, although simplistic and designed for confined aquifers, provides a good estimation of the Fluvial Aquifer's response to various pumping scenarios. Although the aquifer is assumed to be of uniform thickness, this condition is not true in an unconfined aquifer during pumping due to dewatering of the aquifer. Jacob (1944) proposed that a corrected drawdown value could be calculated and then be used in the Theis equation. However, DREAM does not correct the drawdowns using the Jacob method. Therefore the drawdowns calculated and subsequent water levels calculated by DREAM must be considered as approximate.

7.3 DREAM Model Calibration

The DREAM model was applied to the Dunn Field area using a rectangular grid 3,000 feet east-west by 4,000 feet north-south. The pump test well was placed in the center of the grid at the origin. The location of each of the proposed extraction wells for each

scenario was plotted on the grid and given an X coordinate and a Y coordinate based on its location relative to the pump test well.

After the grid was established, the model was calibrated using aquifer parameters from the pumping test conducted in September, 1992. The aquifer parameters used were:

Storage coefficient:	0.19		
Transmissivity:	1994 ft/day		
Natural gradient:	0.015		
Flow direction:	west		
Aquifer thickness:	20 feet		
Porosity:	0.20		

The natural gradient and the flow direction were based on static water level measurements collected from the wells in the Dunn Field area in September, 1992. An approximation to the static water table is shown in Figure 7.1. Due to the simplicity of the model, the gradient was assumed to be constant across the site. An average of the gradients from the north end, where the gradient is the higher, and from the south end, where the gradient is the higher, and from the south end, where the gradient is lower was used. Figure 7.2 shows the actual September, 1992 contours superimposed on the simplified contours used in the DREAM model based on an average gradient. Although the simplified contours do not match the actual site conditions, the figure shows that they are close and that the simplified contours should provide a good estimation of the Fluvial Aquifer. Furthermore, using the same contours as the starting point for each scenario aids in comparing the effect of different scenarios.

7.4 Simulations of Candidate Pumping Scenarios

Numerous trials were performed using the DREAM model to develop an understanding how pumping would affect the contaminated area identified during the RI/FS. The pump test conducted in 1992 (see Section 3.5) revealed that a single well in the Fluvial Aquifer has a specific capacity of 5.8 gpm per foot. For a pumping well in a 20 foot thick aquifer, the maximum operational drawdown should be about 67 percent of the

38 77

- -



 \hat{c}

۱.



aquifer thickness (or about 13 feet). Based upon the specific capacity, a discharge of 75 gpm achieves this drawdown. Simulations with DREAM suggested that a single well provided a capture zone that was about 200 to 300 feet wide. Therefore several trials were performed using multiple wells to understand how these wells modified the flow patterns beneath Dunn Field. These trials can be grouped into three categories:

- 1. Extraction wells within Dunn Field
- 2. Extraction wells in Dunn Field and off-site downgradient
- Extraction and Reinjection wells within Dunn Field

Further trials within these categories revealed only small differences between numbers of wells, flow rates, and capture zones. Therefore these three categories were used as the basis for the following three scenarios.

The duration of pumping can be set for each trial. Modeling short durations of pumping, on the order of days to weeks, predicts a zone of influence relatively close to the pumping locations. Pumping for longer periods, on the order of one to five years, approximates continuous pumping scenarios. In all the scenarios that follow, the duration of pumping was fixed at 5 years. Simulations of longer pumping periods are not productive, since changes in streamflow lines are insignificant beyond this time.

7.4.1 Extraction Wells On-Site (Scenario 1)

Scenario 1 consists of 8 extraction wells all located along the northwest and west boundaries of Dunn Field. The proposed locations of these extraction wells are shown in Figure 7.3 along with the streamlines of flow into these wells. The total flow rate from these wells of 520 gallons per minute (gpm). The southern-most six wells are pumped at 75 gpm, while the two northern-most wells are pumped at 40 gpm and 30 gpm (proceeding northward). Well spacing is approximately 200 feet across the gradient and produces effective control of the streamlines up gradient. The wells to the north are spaced farther apart because they are not perpendicular to the gradient.

- -



Pumping rates were reduced to the north to avoid completely dewatering the aquifer. The contaminated ground water beneath Dunn Field identified during the RI/FS field investigations (see Section 3.5) is completely captured by these wells. This area is estimated to cover some 25 acres. The approximate zone of capture for this scenario is 28 acres of Dunn Field west of the East Boundary, plus another 12 acres off-site (to the north and west of Government property).

7.4.2 Extraction Wells On/Off-Site (Scenario 2)

Scenario 2 consists of eight extraction wells, six located on-site and along the northern and western boundaries of Dunn Field and two off-site approximately 350 feet west near Rozelle Street (see Figure 7.4). Well spacing along the western boundary of Dunn Field is approximately the same as Scenario 1. Two wells from the north are moved off-site down gradient in an effort to capture more of the off-site contamination. Because the line of on-site wells is only 400 feet up gradient from the off-site wells, they intercept water that would otherwise be captured by the off-site wells. To prevent dewatering, the total flow in this scenario was reduced to 395 gpm. The two off-site wells are pumped at 25 gpm and the southern-most well and pump test well are pumped at 50 gpm. The three wells along the west fence are pumped at 70 gpm. The northeast well is pumped at 35 gpm. Like the simulation shown for scenario 1, the duration of pumping is 5 years. In this scenario, the wells along the west boundary are intended to prevent any more contamination from leaving Dunn Field; reducing their number would allow contaminants to be pulled off-site.

The streamlines showing flow to these extraction wells are shown in Figure 7.4. The approximate zone of capture covers about 25 acres of Dunn Field west of the East Boundary, plus another 7 acres off-site. The off-site influence in this scenario is less than Scenario 1 because less control is exerted north of Dunn Field. Because of the interference between the off-site and on-site wells, lower pumping rates are required to

7 10



J.

ł

avoid dewatering the aquifer. These lower pumping rates affected all wells, and had the most effect on the off-site wells. As shown in Figure 7.4, the impact of the off-site wells is only a slight improvement over scenario 1.

7.4.3 Extraction and Reinjection Wells (Scenario 3)

ŀ

Scenario 3 consists of six extraction wells and four reinjection wells. The six extraction wells are located within Dunn Field along the northern and western boundaries. Spacing of these wells is slightly greater than in scenarios 1 and 2. The four reinjection wells are located toward the east boundary of Dunn Field approximately 800 feet upgradient of the extraction wells. The reinjection wells could be located elsewhere, but placing them outside of the capture zone of the extraction wells eliminates opportunities to re-treat the ground water if a treatment system failure inadvertently introduced contaminants back into the aquifer. Locating them inside the capture zone allows effective control should a system failure occur.

The total pumping rate for the extraction wells is 360 gpm, divided equally between the six wells. At reinjection, this flow is distributed equally to the four wells. The proposed locations for these wells are shown in Figure 7.5, along with the streamlines of flow. In this scenario, the approximate zone of capture is 14 acres of Dunn Field west of the East Boundary, plus another 0.5 acres off-site. As before, the duration of pumping is 5 years.

Pumping at higher rates increased the mounding effects around the reinjection wells, and increased the capture of clean ground water north and south of the contaminated zone.

7.5 Comparison of Ground Water Control Scenarios

The three scenarios just described provide an useful contrast in strategies to control contaminated ground water beneath Dunn Field. The use of wells within Dunn Field



ŧ

(Scenario 1) appears to be a feasible and realistic approach to intercepting ground water contaminants.

Moving extraction wells to off-site locations (Scenario 2) where contaminants were found in 1990 somewhat increases the capture of off-site contaminants, but also adds some risk of pulling contaminants beneath Dunn Field off-site. Since the extent of contaminants off-site has not been determined, and because of the time that has elapsed since the 1990 sampling (allowing further migration), the location of off-site contaminants is uncertain. While off-site extraction wells may be part of an ultimate solution, more information on the extent of contamination and nature of pathways appears necessary before the best locations for off-site extraction wells can be determined.

The reinjection of treated ground water (Scenario 3) offers accelerated capture of contaminants beneath Dunn Field, at the expense of capturing more off site contaminants. With reinjection upgradient, contaminants in the Fluvial Aquifer beneath Dunn Field are pushed into the extraction wells, thereby cleaning up that portion of the aquifer more quickly.

7.6 Impacts of Pumping Scenarios

6

7.6.1 Impacts on Nearby Domestic or Production Wells

According to the RI report there are no domestic or production wells completed in the Fluvial Aquifer near the Dunn Field area. The nearest public water supply wells are in the Memphis Sand Aquifer at the Allen Well field owned by the Memphis Light, Gas, and Water Company. Other privately-owned water supply wells are screened in the Memphis Sand Aquifer, and are at some distance away. Although 500 gpm may be pumped from the Fluvial Aquifer at Dunn Field as part of the IRM, there would be no noticeable effect on the Memphis Sand Aquifer.

7 14

7.6.2 Impacts on Nearby Surface Water

1-

The nearest surface water feature to Dunn Field is Cane Creek located 1,600 feet to the north of Dunn Field. The creek lies at an elevation above 240 feet mean sea level (MSL). The water level in the Fluvial Aquifer in Dunn Field is below this elevation (1990 Law), and the creek appears to be recharging the aquifer in the Dunn Field vicinity. The creek drops to 230 feet MSL some 4,000 feet west to Dunn Field, but the Fluvial aquifer at MW-31 (about 400 feet west of Dunn Field) is below 220 feet MSL. Therefore, Cane Creek appears to be losing water to the Fluvial Aquifer along most of its length upstream of its confluence with Nonconnah Creek (at an elevation around 205 ft MSL). Pumping in the Fluvial aquifer beneath Dunn Field would not affect the rate at which the creek recharges the aquifer (hydraulic gradients beneath the creek would be unchanged by pumping) and the reduction in the aquifer water levels would not change any discharge from the aquifer into the creek (it is not occurring in the Dunn Field vicinity).

7.6.3 Reinjection of Treated Water

Reinjection of treated water back into the Fluvial aquifer 800 feet upgradient of the extraction wells will create an artificial mound of ground water that will extend out approximately 500 feet in all directions from the reinjection wells (using the specific capacity and radius of influence derived from the pump test). Since the Fluvial aquifer is some 60 feet below the ground surface in the Dunn Field vicinity, and this mound will be less than 20 feet in thickness, this mound will not affect any surface activities, either in Dunn Field or elsewhere.

Since the State of Tennessee and Shelby County prohibit the injection of water into the aquifer as a means of protecting the public water supply, they would have to allow a variance to current regulations before this could occur.

8.0 DEVELOP/ASSEMBLE TECHNOLOGIES INTO ALTERNATIVES

The technologies which could be used to control ground water migration at Dunn Field were reviewed during the screening analysis described in Section 6.0. Those extraction, treatment, and disposal technologies which were retained are listed below.

- A. Extraction
 - 1. Pumping Wells On Site Only
 - 2. Pumping Wells On and Off Site

B. Treatment

- 1. Air Stripping for VOCs Carbon Air Scrubber option
- 2. UV/Oxidation for VOCs
- 3. Precipitation for metals removal
- 4. Ion exchange for metals removal

C. Disposal

- 1. Sanitary Sewer to POTW
- 2. Surface Water Discharge
- 3. Reinjection

Alternatives for controlling migration of ground water from Dunn Field can be formulated by selecting one technology and process option for each function (extraction, treatment, and disposal). The alternatives considered for the comparative analysis are presented in Table 8.1.

8.1 Alternative 1

This is the No Action Alternative. Selection of the no action Alternative at Dunn Field will be considered as a baseline comparison for the other six alternatives. With no action, the constituents of concern (VOCs and possibly metals) will continue to migrate downward into the Fluvial Aquifer from suspected but currently unidentified sources in Dunn Field. The Fluvial Aquifer will continue to receive these contaminants, and will transport them downgradient to the west. The concentration of these contaminants will diminish at greater distances from Dunn Field as mixing, adsorption and absorption

Alternative	Extraction	Treatment	Disposal
	<u> </u>		
1	No Action	none	none
2	Deep wells on-site	air stripping ¹ metals option	municipal sewer
3	Deep wells on- and off-site	air stripping ¹ metals option	municipal sewer
4	Deep wells on-site	UV/oxidation metals option	municipal sewer
5	Deep wells on-site	air stripping ¹ metals option	surface drainage
6	Deep wells on-site	UV/oxidation metals option	surface drainage
7	Dccp wells on-site	air stripping ¹ metals option	reinjection up-gradient on-site

Table 8.1Summary of Remedial AlternativesInterim Remedial Measure for Ground WaterDDRC Dunn Field

Source: ES, 1993.

 $^1 \mbox{Note}$ - Carbon adsorption option can be added to control air emissions of VOCs if required

occur. VOCs will be further diminished by chemical breakdown and naturally occurring biodegradation. The rate at which these process would occur in the Fluvial Aquifer is not known and cannot be predicted without further study. Furthermore, the distance and area off-site that would ultimately be affected by the constituents of concern cannot be predicted until further studies are performed.

8.2 Alternative 2

The ground water extraction system for Alternative 2 consists of eight wells located on Government property in Dunn Field. The approximate configuration of these eight wells is shown on Figure 7.3. The well locations were selected to extract ground water from the areas of the plumes shown on pages 3-14 and 3-15 to be most heavily contaminated. The average depth of the wells is estimated to be 80 feet each. Each well would be equipped with an individual submersible pump capable of pumping 75 gpm. Based on the models discussed in Section 7.3, eight wells pumping at rates between 30 and 75 gpm would create a capture zone of approximately 40 acres, including 12 acres outside the boundaries of Dunn Field.

Discharge from the eight wells would be directed to the 70,000 gallon holding tank constructed for the pumping test (1992 ES). The purpose of this tank would be twofold. First, it would provide flow equalization. Minimizing fluctuation in flow would improve performance and reduce the size of the treatment system. Second, the tank would provide sufficient detention time to allow any sediments to settle which might otherwise reduce the efficiency of the treatment system.

The extracted ground water would be pumped from the equalization tank to an air stripping tower for removal of volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Removal of metals, if future sampling confirms this is necessary, would be performed after VOC treatment. Based on a flow rate of 520 gpm and the expected VOC concentrations shown in Table 8.2, an air stripping tower could be selected to achieve the Maximum

Table 8.2 Expected Concentrations in Extracted Ground Water for Contaminants of Concern

	Concentration		MCL or	Percent Removal	
Constituent	(ppb)	(ppb)	MCLG (ppb)	Required	Expected
Volatile Organic Chemicals	160	50	7	96	00
1,1 dichloroethene 1,2 dichloroethene (total)	520	200	70	80 65	99
1 1 2 2 tetrachloroethane	1 900	200	n/a	n/a	90
tetrachloroethene	240	100	5		<u>9</u> 9
trichloroethene	5,100	350	5	98.6	99
carbon tetrachloride	77	8	5	38	99
Metals ¹					
arsenic	210	30	50	0	
barium	3,740 ²	800	2,000	0	
chromium	1,2402	80	50	38	40
lead	1,000	150	15	90	90
nickel	602 ²	80	100	0	

Source: ES, 1993.

ţ

¹Note: Metals concentrations, both highest and expected, are based upon 1989/1990 sampling during RI/FS (1990 Law). The 1992 sampling at the pump test well in this vicinity exhibited concentrations below MCLs/MCLGs (See Table 4.1 this report). Another round of sampling is required to confirm the presence of metal constituents above cleanup goals.

²Note: Quality control spikes for sample batch were not within control limits during first Phase. The second round of sampling detected lower maximums, but still above MCL/MCLGs.

n/a Not Applicable NR Not Required

Contaminant Levels (MCL) and the Maximum Contaminant Level Goals (MCLG). Table 8.2 shows both the highest VOC concentration in any monitoring well during the RI/FS (1990 Law) as well as the expected concentrations from the eight extraction wells. Expected concentrations would be less than the maximum observed because water would be withdrawn from several points across the plume and mixed together before treatment. The expected removal of VOCs is based upon their physical properties, and the expected removals in Table 8.2 are based upon a system removing 99 percent of trichloroethene.

Ground water would enter the air stripping unit at the top and flow by gravity downward while air is being blown into the bottom using a blower. The water would cascade over packing media which improves the transfer of VOCs to the air. An air stripping tower meeting the performance criteria in Table 8.2 could be readily procured for this application. The air stripper would be equipped with a control panel which would stop ground water pumping if the air stripper blower malfunctioned. Periodic cleaning of the packing media would be required to maintain the efficiency of the system.

Based upon the concentrations in Table 8.2, the extraction wells will produce approximately 2,910 pounds per year of VOCs (Table 8.3). The air stripping unit will transfer approximately 2,820 pounds/year (1,280 kg/yr) of VOCs into the atmosphere, and discharge about 90 pounds/year (41 kg/yr) into the water effluent. The greatest single constituent in the air emissions is trichloroethene with an annual load of 1,120 pounds/year (510 kg/yr). An air stripper equipped with a 1,000 scfm (standard cubic feet per minute) blower would emit trichloroethene at an average concentration of 34 micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m³). The greatest single constituent in the water effluent would be 1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethane at a load of 64 lbs/yr (29 kg/yr), or an

8-5

VOC Constituent	Concentration Influent (ppb)	Total Load (lbs/yr)	Airborne Load (lbs/yr)	Water Load (lbs/yr)
1,1 dichloroethene	50	160	158	2
1,2 dichloroethene (total)	200	640	634	6
1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethane	200	640	576	64
tetrachloroethene	100	320	317	3
trichloroethene	350	1,120	1,109	11
carbon tetrachloride	8	26	25	1
Rounded	Totals	2,910	2,820	90

Table 8.3 Summary of VOC Loadings to Air and Water Alternative 2

.

Source: ES, 1993.

(

{

. .

.

average concentration of 20 ug/L. There is currently no MCL for 1,1,2,2 tetrachloroethane.

Based on the Memphis-Shelby County Health Department air permitting requirements, purification of the exhaust would not be required. Sampling ports would be available on the air stripper to measure air emissions. If purification was determined necessary or desirable, the air stripper could be equipped with carbon adsorption units capable of removing greater than 99 percent of the VOCs from the air before exhausting it into the atmosphere. Regeneration of the spent carbon could be arranged through a vendor or it could be disposed of in a hazardous waste landfill.

If metals removal is required, the RI/FS data indicates that chromium and lead will be the constituents requiring treatment. As discussed in Section 6.0, precipitation or ion exchange are technologies that appear feasible for achieving the cleanup goals. Since the extracted ground water exhibits relatively low levels of total dissolved solids (260 mg/L during the pump test), ion exchange appears well suited for this requirement. A treatability study would be required to select and demonstrate which resin or resins would remove both lead and chromium to the required levels. If a single resin could not treat both chromium and lead, then two different resins would be operated in series. This process would exchange sodium or a similar ion for lead and chromium. Periodic regeneration of the resin would create wastewater that would have to be filtered to remove lead and chromium, thereby producing a sludge. This sludge would have to be landfilled off site at a permitted facility.

Treated water would be conveyed to the sanitary sewer manhole located west of Dunn Field on Kyle Street. The sewer line at this location is 8-inch diameter ductile iron pipe. Due to the continuous addition of 520 gpm from the treated ground water, the sewer line would need to be upgraded to a 12-inch ductile iron or vitreous clay pipe. Pipe upgrades would have to continue downstream until a pipe capable of carrying current sewage plus the treated water was reached.

Sanitary sewage at Kyle Street is conveyed to the City of Memphis - South Wastewater Treatment Facility. This plant is designed for 80 million gallons per day (MGD), is currently operating at 65 MGD, and can easily accommodate the additional 0.75 MGD of treated ground water. The low concentration of VOCs and heavy metals in the treated ground water would not adversely effect the current operation of this facility. A sewer use charge would be assessed by the City of Memphis based on the quantity discharged to the POTW.

8.3 Alternative 3

The pumping and treatment system for Alternative 3 is identical to Alternative 2 except for the placement of extraction wells. Like Alternative 2, this alternative has eight extraction wells, but two of them are located west of Dunn Field downgradient from the property boundary. Alternative 3 provides greater capture of contaminated ground water off-site from Dunn Field. The extracted water would be pumped to Dunn Field for treatment by air stripping and conveyed to the POTW as described in Section 8.2. If metals treatment is required, the same approach as outlined for Alternative 2 would be employed.

The approximate configuration of the eight wells is shown on Figure 7.4. The locations were selected to create a line of extraction wells which would intercept the contaminant plume as it migrated off Government property as well as collect contaminated ground water further down gradient. Based on the models discussed in Section 7.4.2, eight wells pumping at 395 gpm would create a capture zone of approximately 32 acres, encompassing ground water beneath Dunn Field and to the north and west of Dunn Field.

8-8

Extraction wells operating off Government property would require easements, rightsof-way, or property acquisition from landholders. The security and integrity of these wells would have to be be maintained. Additional piping would be needed to convey the off-site groundwater back to Government property for treatment.

8.4 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would employ UV/oxidation to treat the ground water. The same ground water extraction and disposal configuration described for Alternative 2 in Section 8.2 would be used with Alternative 4. Ground water extracted on Government property would be treated using UV/oxidation prior to disposal to the POTW. If metals treatment is required, the same approach as outlined for Alternative 2 would be employed.

Extracted ground water would be conveyed to an ULTROX UV/oxidation treatment system or an approved equal. This process would use ultraviolet light, ozone and hydrogen peroxide to breakdown the VOCs into carbon dioxide, water and harmless inorganic chlorides. Parallel systems could be designed to remove greater than 99 percent of the VOCs from the ground water flowing through the process at a combined rate of 520 gpm. Components of the system would include a hydrogen peroxide feed tank and pump; air compressor and dryer; ozone generator, UV/oxidation reactor; and catalytic ozone decomposer. No contaminants would be released into the atmosphere.

For operation over a long period of time, the treatment process should be placed on a concrete pad. As a minimum, an enclosure would be constructed to house electrical equipment from the elements. The treatment process would be equipped with a control panel which would stop ground water pumping to the unit if the UV/oxidation system experienced a malfunction.

0.0

8.5 Alternative 5

Ċ

ŗ,

Alternative 5 would extract ground water from Government property and treat it using air stripping as described in Section 8.2 for Alternative 2. If metals treatment is required, the same approach as outlined for Alternative 2 would be employed. The treated water from Alternative 5 would be conveyed to the natural storm water drainage for discharge.

Surface drainage channels exit from the north boundary and the west boundary of Dunn Field. Both convey runoff to Cane Creek located to the north, but the channel to the north of Dunn Field offers the shortest distance to Cane Creek, approximately 1,600 feet. This channel traverses a non-residential area between Dunn Field and Cane Creek. The channel is about 1.5 feet wide and 1 foot deep at the Dunn Field property line and has a capacity at that point of 20 cubic feet per second (cfs), which is sufficient to carry the continuous 520 gpm (1.16 cfs) being discharged from the treatment system. This flow would occupy the bottom of the channel and stay well within its banks.

A ridge exists between the anticipated location of the treatment system and the drainage ditch in the northeast corner of Dunn Field. To overcome this gradient, a force main would be constructed to the outfall using 10-inch PVC pipe. Discharge into Cane Creek would require a new NPDES permit or a modification to the current permit held by DDRC.

8.6 Alternative 6

Alternative 6 would extract ground water from Government property and treat it using UV/oxidation. The extraction scheme would be the same as the on-site wells in Alternative 2. The treatment process would be the same as Alternative 4. The treated water would be conveyed to the surface drainage as in Alternative 5.

This alternative combines a more expensive treatment process, UV/oxidation, with a potentially less expensive water disposal strategy, discharge to surface drainage.

8.7 Alternative 7

6.

Alternative 7 would extract ground water from six wells on Government property pumping at a rate of 360 gpm. The extracted water would be treated using air stripping as described in Section 8.2 for Alternative 2. If metals treatment is required, the same approach as outlined for Alternative 2 would be employed. The treated water from Alternative 7 would be reinjected directly into the Fluvial Aquifer up gradient from the extraction wells on Dunn Field.

Reinjection through four wells installed on the eastern side of Dunn Field would provide a controlled means of disposing of the treated ground water. The location of proposed reinjection wells is shown on Figure 7.5. The impact on ground water flow has been modeled and discussed in Section 7.4.3.

Pumps and piping would have to be installed to transmit the water from the treatment site to the east side of Dunn Field. Biological activity in the injection wells can foul screens and require periodic routine cleaning to maintain the desired recharge rates.

Chemically altered water is not normally allowed to be reinjected into the ground by the Memphis County Groundwater Quality Control Board of Shelby County. Under this alternative, the treated water would meet regulatory requirements for the constituents of concern in drinking water. Since it would be injected upgradient from the area of extraction, the treated water could be recaptured and treated again if undesirable constituents were introduced into the aquifer.

9.0 PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS

DDRC was added to the National Priorities List (NPL) in October 1992 (see 57 FR 47180, October 14, 1992), bringing DDRC under the jurisdiction of the federal Superfund (CERCLA) program. The U.S. EPA determined in the final rule [1985] NCP section 300.68 (a) (3)] that "Federal, State, and local permits are not required for Fund-financed action or remedial actions taken pursuant to Federal action under section 106 of CERCLA". The 1986 amendments to CERCLA implemented this section with a statutory provision, section 121 (e) (1), that provides that no Federal, State, or local permit shall be required for the portion of any removal, or remedial action conducted entirely on-site, where such remedial action is selected and carried out in compliance with Section 121. The reason for the permit exemption is to preserve flexibility and avoid lengthy, time-consuming procedures when developing and implementing remedial alternatives. Remedies selected must be protective of human health and the environment, and must meet substantive requirements under any Federal environmental law or more stringent State law that are identified as applicable or relevant and appropriate (1988 U.S. EPA). A copy of EPA's OSWER Directive 9355.7-03, Permits and Permit Equivalency Processes for CERCLA On-site Response Actions, is provided in Appendix G of this report.

The 1990 NCP [section 300.400 (e) (1)] clarifies this condition for "on-site" actions, defining "on-site" as "the areal extent of contamination and all suitable areas in very close proximity to the contamination necessary for implementation of the response action". The preamble to the NCP (at 55 FR 8689, March 8, 1990) explains that "areal" refers both to the surface areas and the air above the site. EPA policy further defines "on-site" to include the soil and the ground water plume that are to be remediated.

While permits may not be required for CERCLA on-site response actions, some permitting authorities (Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Pollution Control and the Memphis-Shelby County Groundwater Quality Control Board) require lead agency participation in a process that is "equivalent" to a permitting process in spite of the EPA OSWER Directive found in Appendix G. In accordance with the OSWER Directive, DDRC should actively consult on a regular and frequent basis with the permitting authority to help hasten ARAR identification. To facilitate this arrangement, copies of submittals provided by the design contractor and the remedial action contractor would be submitted in a timely manner to the permitting authority whose ARARs are the subject of the submittals. However, any such agreement should be based on the understanding that a procedural "permit" or permit equivalency approval is not required, but that the lead agency (DDRC) is participating in the process in order to facilitate coordination and consultation with the permitting authority. Under a permit "equivalency" process the applicant would pursue a permit and the lead agency would waive most fees and public hearing requirements. This "equivalent" permitting process is conducted to satisfy the authority's concern that there will be compliance with ARARs. The permitting authorities argue that participation in a permit-like process is necessary to identify the substantive provisions of permitting regulations (1992 U.S. EPA).

Several "equivalent" or substantive actions are required to comply with the Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Pollution Control and the Memphis-Shelby County Groundwater Quality Control Board for direct on-site discharges and other on-site actions. Off-site discharges from Dunn Field directly to receiving waters, or indirectly to POTWs must comply with applicable and local substantive requirements and are not exempt from formal administrative permitting requirements. Under the Clean Water Act, operation of the preferred alternative would be considered to be a "direct"

C N

discharge. By EPA definition, direct discharge of wastewater is conside4ed to be onsite if the receiving water body is in the area of contamination or is in very close proximity to the site and is necessary for implementation of the response action (even if the water body flows off-site). The preferred alternative meets the criteria of on-site discharge, as the plant discharge will occur in the immediate proximity of the waste site (Dunn Field) and willbe directed to an existing drainage channel on-site. Thus, compliance with administrative ARARs is not required (August 1988 US EPA; August 1989 US EPA; and OSWER Directive 9234.1.02). Table 9.1 presents the actual permit requirements and the proposed "equivalent" or substantive requirements for the technologies which could be used to control ground water contamination beneath Dunn Field. Appendix D presents the permit application forms required for ground water treatment systems in Shelby County, Tennessee. The proposed "equivalency" permit submittal process and fees are described below for each alternative ground water system.

Ground Water Extraction Wells - A ground water treatment system could require the construction of six to eight extraction wells. A proposed "equivalency" well permit must be filed with the Memphis-Shelby County Health Department to meet administrative requirements. The proposed "equivalency" well permit is site specific and is valid for ninety days. An extension of three months can be requested before the proposed "equivalency" permit expires. The "equivalency" well permit fee is waived. (If an actual well permit is requested within ten days the cost is \$125.00).

ł

TABLE 9.1

						38	102
	"Equivalent" NPDES <u>Permit</u>				×	×	ted ground water
City of Memphis	Discharge Agreement (POTW)	×	×	×			rd prohibits reinj o c
•	"Equivalent" Operating Air Quality Permit	×	×	×	×	×	r Quality Control Boa
•	-Equivalent" Construction Air Ovality Permit	×	×	×	×	×	County Groundwates
- -	Equivalent Construction Well Permit	X	×	×	×	×	M¢mphia-Shelby
	Technology	Alternative 2 <u>Air Strinber Treatment System</u> (Extract on site, POTW)	Alternative 3 <u>Pumps on/off site</u> (Air Stripper Treatment,POTW)	Alternative 4 <u>UY/Oxidation Treatment System</u> (Extract on site,POTW)	Alternative 5 Discharge to Surface Drainage (Extract on site, air stripper treatment, on-site, direct discharge to drainage channel)	Alternative 6 <u>Discharce to Surface Drainace</u> (Extract on site, UV/oxidation treatment,on-site, direct discharge to drainage channel)	Alternative 7 <u>Ground Water Reinjoction</u> (Extract on site, air stripper treatment)

9-4

Permit Requirements for Ground Water Treatment Technologies

Source: ES, 1993,

The permit "equivalency" process proposed by several state and tocal agencies is in direct conflict with the OSWER Directive provided in Appendix G of this report. This information is provided to reflect guidance issued by these agencies and does not reflect DDRC's intention to acquiese to these "permits-equivalent." DDRC will, however, comply with all substantive ARARs issued by these agencies during the design phase and will provide copies of design submittals for for the preferred alternative to the agencies for their review and comment. +

Air Stripping and UV/Oxidation Treatment System An air stripping treatment system and a UV/Oxidation treatment system require the same substantive actions. The extracted ground water would be pumped through an air stripping unit (Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and 7). This process releases volatile organic compounds into the atmosphere and must meet all emission requirements. The Memphis-Shelby County Pollution Control Health Department requires an "equivalency" construction permit for the installation of a UV/Oxidation or air stripper treatment unit. The proposed "equivalency" construction permit involves submission of design specifications, identification of particulates emitted and an emission estimation for the treatment system. Based on air stripper and UV/Oxidation technology, there are no emission standards for VOCs and therefore each system is handled on an individual basis. If air emissions exceed 25 tons per year or more of particulate matter, the "best available control technology (BACT)" shall be utilized at the time of the proposed "equivalency" permit application. The emission rate and BACT requirements in Memphis-Shelby County for VOC sources are handled on a case by case basis. There are no minimum BACT requirements for VOC emissions, since Memphis-Shelby County is a nonattainment area for ozone.

Memphis Shelby County is a non-attainment area for ozone, which is regulated under the CAA in accordance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Non-attainment area permits are issued under state or local jurisdiction. A CERCLA site would not be considered a major source unless its emissions equalled or exceeded 100 tons or more per year of the pollutant for which the area is designated nonattainment. Sources emitting a non-attainment pollutant must meet the lowest achievable emission rate.

The Memphis-Shelby County Pollution Department determines the type of VOC monitoring that is required for the treatment system. The Department has no fixed requirements for monitoring, and determines the frequency and monitoring parameters

on a case by case basis. The "equivalency" permit fee is waived (the actual permit fee for a construction permit is \$200.00). The time requirement for approval of the proposed "equivalency" construction permit is approximately 90 days or less. A proposed "equivalency" operating permit would be filed, once the proposed "equivalency" construction permit has been approved. The "equivalency" operating permit fee is waived (the actual permit fee is \$50.00 per year), if the system emits less than twenty-five tons per year.

Based upon this information, the water treatment system will not require carbon adsorption units to purify air emissions, since the expected emission rate of 1.4 tons of VOCs per year falls well below the threshold for a major pollutant source.

<u>Water Discharged to POTW</u>. A discharge to a POTW is considered an off-site activity. Therefore, CERCLA responses are required to comply with substantive and procedural requirements of the national pretreatment program and all local pretreatment regulations before discharging wastewater to a POTW.

Treated water from Dunn Field would be conveyed to the sanitary sewer manhole located west of Dunn Field on Kyle Street. The sewer system at Kyle Street is directly conveyed to the City of Memphis South Treatment facility (also known as T.E. Maxon Facility). Discharging into the City of Memphis sewer system requires (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4) a written agreement with the city. The written agreement consists of identification of the constituents in the treated water and the amount of discharge to the city. In addition, there is a fee of \$0.5868 cents per 1,000 gallons of treated water if the biological oxygen demand (BOD) is below 255 PPM and suspended solids are below 330 ppm. Additional charges could be rendered if BOD and suspended solids increase above these levels,

Water Discharged to Surface Water.

Treated water would be released into on-site surface water at a discharge point in the northern part of Dunn Field (Alternatives 5 and 6). Section 121(e) of CERCLA exempts any response action conducted on-site from having to obtain a Federal, State, or local permit. Under the Clean Water Act, discharge to surface drainage would be considered to a direct discharge. By EPA definition, direct discharge of wastewater is considered to be on-site if the receiving water body is in the area of contamination or is in very close proximity to the site and is necessary for implementation of the response action (even if the water body flows off-site) (August, 1988 USEPA; August, 1989 USEPA; and OSWER Directive 9234.1-02).

DDRC would file a proposed "equivalent" NPDES permit application to describe this discharge location, the continuous discharge rate and the constituent levels for the onsite treatment system in order to solicit substantive ARARS. However, the administrative requirement for either a permit or permit-equivalent would not be applicable because this will be an on-site discharge in accordance with OSWER Directive 9355.7-03.

Other Substantive Requirements

The NPDES permit program established other substantive requirements for the direct discharge of pollutants to surface waters that may be applicable or relevant and appropriate to circumstances at Dunn Field. These NPDES permit requirements are contained in 40 CFR Parts 122-125 and include:

Monitoring - As required in 40 CFR 122.44 (i), continued compliance with applicable NPDES discharge limitations is ensured through the establishment of monitoring requirements for the discharger. The regulation requires monitoring of the mass (or other specified measurement) of each pollutant regulated and the volume of effluent discharged from each point source. Other requirements include designation of monitoring points, monitoring frequency, sample types, and analytical methods. In addition to monitoring for regulated pollutant parameters, monitoring may be required for other pollutants of concern. These additional monitoring requirements are developed on a case-by-case basis.

Best Management Practices - In addition to standard discharge limits, best management practices (BMP) provisions can be required on a case-by-case basis (40 CFR 125.103(b)). These requirements can be incorporated into the NPDES permit and/or the CERCLA site decision documents.

Ground Water Reinjection Treatment System Memphis-Shelby County Groundwater Quality Control Board prohibits reinjected ground water. Section 13 of the Rules and Regulations promulgated by the Memphis County Groundwater Quality Control Board of Shelby County states "no injection wells of any type shall be allowed in Memphis and Shelby County for the injection of ground waters or chemically or thermally altered water into the underground formations. No well constructed shall be used for recharge, injection, or disposal purposes, no further consideration is given to this method." A copy of Section 13 of the Rules and Regulations have been included in Appendix D. A waiver for a reinjection system would be required from the Memphis-Shelby County Water Quality Control Board. This waiver would have to be accepted by EPA and the State of Tennessee. Frequent chemical testing of the reinjected water would be required to assure protection of the ground water supplies.

10.0 DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives developed and screened in Section 8.0 are subjected to a detailed analysis in this section. Nine criteria are used in this analysis, as mandated by the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) (40 CFR 300.430(e)(9)). These criteria are as follows:

- Overall protection of human health and the environment;
- Compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs);
- Long-term effectiveness and permanence;
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment;
- Short-term effectiveness;
- Implementability;
- Cost;

ſ

- State Acceptance; and
- Community Acceptance.

The considerations incorporated into these criteria are summarized in Table 10.1. The basis for defining the scope of these criteria comes from the Interim Final Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies under CERCLA (1988 EPA/540/G-89/004, OSWER). There is some overlap among these criteria, resulting in repetitiveness, but this overlap assures that all important aspects of each alternative have been considered.

10.1 Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment

The No Action Alternative (Alternative 1) would provide no protection to human health and the environment other than that provided by natural attenuation, dilution, sorption, and limited biodegradation. The other alternatives (Alternatives 2-7) provide effective control of contaminated ground water beneath the northern portion of Dunn Field and beneath off-site land immediately north and west (down gradient). These alternatives are to minimize horizontal ground water migration in the Fluvial Aquifer, and intercept
TABLE 10.1

.

Description of Alternative Screening Criteria

Screening Criteria	Description of Criteria
Overall Protection Human Health and Environment	This criterion requires assessment of how each alternative, as a whole achieves and maintains protection of human health and the environ- ment.
Compliance with ARARs	This criterion requires a description of how each alternative, will achieve ARARs. Included in this evaluation are chemical-specific, action-specific, and location-specific ARARs as well as other criteria, advisories, and guidelines to-be-considered.
Short-term Effectiveness	This criterion requires an evaluation of how human health and the environment will be protected during construction and implementation of the remedial alternative up until the time that response objectives are met. This includes protection of community and site workers and their associated environment.
Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence	This criterion requires an evaluation of how human health and the environment will be protected after response objectives have been met. This requires a comparison of the magnitude of residual risk and the adequacy and reliability of controls. Permanence is measured as the degree to which treatment is irreversible.
Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume through Treatment	This criterion evaluates the anticipated performance of the specific process options that makeup each of the alternatives screened. Included in this evaluation is an estimation of the amounts of hazardous materials destroyed or treated and the types and quantities of residuals remaining after treatment.
Implementability	This criterion requires an evaluation of the technical and administrative feasibility of constructing and operating each alternative, including the availability of required goods and services (technologies, offsite TSD facilities, technical specialists). Also included here is an evaluation of the reliability of selected technologies, the case of undertaking additional remedial measures if necessary, and the ability to obtain necessary permits and approvals.
Cost	This criterion is used to compare the capital and O&M costs associated with implementing each alternative. Present worth costs are summarized for each option using a 10 year period and an 8 percent discount rate scenario.
State Acceptance	This criterion requires an assessment of the State Regulatory Agency or support agency's preference among screened alternatives. This criterion will be addressed in concluding fashion in the Proposed Plan.
Community Acceptance	This criterion requires an assessment of the community's preferences for and concerns about selected alternatives. This criterion will be addressed in concluding fashion in the Proposed Plan.
Source: ES, 1993.	

ł

future releases of contaminants from Dunn Field as long as the extraction system is operated. These alternatives do not protect the Memphis Sand Aquifer down gradient from Dunn Field, other than by intercepting the contaminated portion of the Fluvial Aquifer before it migrates off-site.

The treatment system employing UV/Oxidation (Alternatives 4 and 6) will destroy chlorinated solvents in the water, thereby preventing these toxic materials from harming the environment.

Air emissions from the alternatives employing air stripping (Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and 7) will transfer VOCs from the ground water into the atmosphere. The emissions into the atmosphere will not exceed risk limits to human health.

10.2 Compliance with ARARs

s.

The No Action Alternative (Alternative 1) would provide no compliance with ARARs. The other alternatives (Alternatives 2-7) provide compliance with chemical-specific ARARs by removing VOCs from ground water beneath Dunn Field to levels below state and federal standards for drinking water. If metals found in ground water during the RI/FS in 1989 and 1990 are conclusively identified in the Fluvial aquifer, treatment would be incorporated to meet other chemical-specific ARARs. Other action-specific or location-specific ARARs have not been identified at this time.

The alternative providing reinjection (Alternative 7) of treated water back into the Fluvial Aquifer does not comply with State and County regulations prohibiting reinjection to protect the public water supply. A variance to this ARAR would be required from the State and County to allow reinjection.

10.3 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence

The alternatives involving ground water pumping (Alternatives 2-7) provide a partial solution to achieving long-term effectiveness and permanence. These alternatives are

not permanent in that when the ground water extraction system is shut down, migration of contaminants in the Fluvial Aquifer away from Dunn Field resumes. A sourcecontrol action would be required to stop this migration before long-term effectiveness is achieved.

10.4 Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume Through Treatment

The alternatives involving ground water pumping (Alternatives 2-7) provide effective control over the mobility of contaminants in ground water beneath the northern portion of Dunn Field and areas down gradient west of Dunn Field. The alternatives using UV/Oxidation for treatment (Alternatives 4 and 6) provide destruction of an estimated 1.4 tons per year of VOCs (see Table 8.3), thereby eliminating their toxicity and mobility, reducing their volume in the ground water environment, and preventing their dispersion into the atmosphere.

The alternatives employing air stripping (Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and 7) reduce the toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminants in the ground water, but create a larger volume of air containing low levels of these contaminants that are below toxic risk limits.

10.5 Short-Term Effectiveness

ſ.

With the alternatives involving ground water pumping (Alternatives 2-7), effective control of the ground water movement beneath Dunn Field and adjacent areas occurs within weeks after system startup. The community will experience negligible changes in protection during this period, since these alternatives do not control all contaminants in the Fluvial Aquifer downgradient.

With the reinjection alternative (Alternative 7), introducing treated water into the aquifer upgradient of the contaminated zone serves to accelerate the movement of contaminated ground water toward the extraction wells. While this action serves to

hasten the cleanup beneath Dunn Field, it also reduces the influence of the extraction wells down gradient from Dunn Field.

10.6 Implementability

The alternatives using ground water extraction (Alternatives 2-7) would employ wells, piping, pumps, and many off-of-the-shelf other components that are widely available from many vendors.

The alternatives employing air stripping (Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and 7) utilize off-of-theshelf systems that also can be procured from many vendors. The construction and erection of these components can easily be achieved using skills available in the local area. The UV/Oxidation treatment system (Alternatives 4 and 6) is a specialized system that is available from only a small number of vendors. The erection of this system would be performed using local skills and specialized supervision from the vendor.

The alternatives using the POTW for water disposal (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4) will require state and local approval for discharge of treated water. Disposal of treated water into surface drainage (Alternatives 5 and 6) is an on-site discharge which must meet substantive NPDES requirements only. Disposal of treated water by reinjection (Alternative 7) will require a variance to the ground water protection regulations that prohibit reinjection.

Environmental monitoring of both air and water discharges would be required for alternatives using air stripping treatment (Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and 7). Monitoring of water discharges from the UV/oxidation system (Alternatives 4 and 6) would be required, but air monitoring would not be necessary.

Alternatives using POTW disposal (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4) will require the enlargement of sanitary sewers off-site, since current sewers adjacent to Dunn Field are

not large enough to carry the new flow. Discharge rates into sewers could not be reduced without reducing the capture zone around the pumping wells. The distance for which sewer upgrades would be needed has been estimated at 2,000 linear feet to reach trunk sewers offering additional capacity. The POTW (the South Wastewater Treatment Plant) has sufficient capacity to handle the additional flow generated by the treatment system, and could accept the long-term discharge of treated water.

Construction of extraction wells, treatment units, piping, and other utilities will be restricted to the perimeter of Dunn Field to avoid interference with any potential source control actions at known burial trenches. Otherwise the locations of extraction wells are not critical, and well locations could be shifted 20 to 30 feet in any direction should obstacles be discovered during the design or construction process. Extraction wells will be installed along the fence, and connected by underground piping running along the fence. The ground water treatment system would be installed near the perimeter in an area known to be free of burial trenches. All discharge piping, electrical utilities, and service roads also can be located away from known burial areas. Nevertheless, contaminated soils may be encountered during construction of wells or pipe trenches, requiring special disposal of these soils.

Construction of extraction wells off-site (Alternative 3) would require negotiations with property owners to obtain easements for well locations, piping, and electrical service. If agreements cannot be reached with one owner, then negotiations would be needed with another owner, thereby extending the period to implement this alternative.

The extraction system could be expanded at some future date as more information is developed on ground water conditions away from Dunn Field. Additional extraction wells could be installed either on or off Government property, increasing the total flow of contaminated ground water. This flow could be treated in a new treatment unit located near those wells or piped to the unit serving the initial wells. Modifications at

and the second second

the initial treatment unit would be required if more capacity was needed. Disposal of treated water would increase to flow to the POTW or to surface drainage. If disposal was by reinjection, new reinjection wells would be required to accommodate flows from the new wells.

10.7 Cost

An evaluation of design, construction, and operation and maintenance costs has been performed for each of the alternatives. The No Action Alternative (Alternative 1) offers the least cost action, saving the construction and operational expenses associated with this action. The No Action Alternative carries a potential future cost for replacing community water supplies and managing the increased risk of disease and suffering associated with consumption of contaminated ground water.

The cost of installing extraction wells (Alternatives 2-7) is the same for all alternatives, except for the special features. The installation of wells off Government property (Alternative 3) will increase the costs of negotiating access and easements, but will not increase the cost of the wells themselves as long as the number of wells remains constant. The alternative providing reinjection (Alternative 7) has higher costs since more extraction wells spaced closer together are needed to insure that all constituents upgradient are captured. This alternative also requires injection wells to handle all treated flows.

The ground water treatment requirements for VOCs can be accomplished using air stripping (Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and 7), which is cheaper than UV/Oxidation (Alternatives 4 and 6). The operation and maintenance cost for the air stripping equipment is less than the UV/Oxidation system. Should metals treatment be required (chromium and lead are the likely candidates), ion exchange appears to be the preferred technology.

The disposal of treated water to the POTW (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4) carries a sewer discharge fee that makes up 30 to 50 percent of the annual operation and maintenance costs. The disposal of treated water to surface drainage (Alternatives 5 and 6) offers the least cost, since there are no sewer use charges and other operation and maintenance costs are low. The alternative providing reinjection (Alternative 7) has higher costs since more labor will be needed periodically to clean the reinjection wells.

A summary of the capital and operation and maintenance costs are presented in Table 10.2. The net present value for each alternative is computed using a 10-year operating period and an 8 percent discount rate. The cost per 1,000 gallons is derived from the net present value, using the gallons pumped over the 10-year period as an estimate for the total pumpage. Any of the extraction alternatives (2 through 7) will achieve capture of contaminants initially in the ground water within a few years after startup, but continued operation of the system would be needed until a permanent solution is found to halt or intercept the contaminants migrating downward from the burial areas into the Fluvial aquifer. The 10-year operating period provides time to investigate these burial areas more thoroughly and develop a strategy for cleanup. Details for the cost estimates are presented in Appendix F.

The capital cost and operation and maintenance cost of ion exchange to accomplish metals removal has been estimated, but has not been included in the alternatives. The derivation of these costs is presented in Appendix F, with a summary shown in Table 10.2. These costs can be added to any of the alternatives to determine the total costs should metals treatment prove to be required.

10.8 State Acceptance

ł

.'

This section will be revised following State of Tennessee review and comment during the public comment period allowed for this document and for the Environmental Assessment document. Discussions with personnel from the State of Tennessee,

2

.

Table 10.2

Summary of Costs Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water DDRC-Dunn Field

А	lternative	Capital Costs (1993 \$)	Operation and Maintenance (1993 \$)	Net Present Worth (1993 \$)	Cost Per 000 gal (1993 \$)
1	No Action	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Extraction On-Site Air Stripping POTW	599,478	270,187	2,233,756	\$0.817
3	Extraction On/Off-Site Air Stripping POTW	604,293	229,327	1,984,349	\$0.956
4	Extraction On-Site UV/Oxidation POTW	825,248	303,487	2,649,696	\$0.969
5	Extraction On-Site Air Stripping Surface Water	471,078	131,000	1,250,092	\$0.457
6	Extraction On-Site UV/Oxidation Surface Water	659,398	163 ,50 0	1,626,386	\$ Q. <i>5</i> 95
7	Extraction On-Site Air Stripping Reinjection	498,213	149,200	1,388, 29 4	\$0.7 34
Me	tals Treatment (Chromium & Lead)	1,089,260	102,500	1,645,411	\$0.602

Source: ES, 1993.

Department of Environment and Conservation, resulted in the following preliminary findings: the State would accept alternatives which control migration of ground water contaminants from beneath Dunn Field (Alternatives 2-6). The State would approve the alternative which provides destruction of the toxic constituents (Alternative 4) using treatment by UV/oxidation. The State would approve the discharge of treated water into the local POTW (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4), provided the POTW has accepted this discharge. The State would approve the discharge of treated water into surface drainage (Alternatives 5 and 6), provided proper sampling procedures documented dischargeable levels of contaminants after treatment and before discharge. The State would oppose reinjection of treated water (Alternative 7) because that action could adversely affect public water supplies if a process malfunction occurs.

10.9 Community Acceptance

This section will be revised following community review and comment during the public comment period allowed for this document and for the Environmental Assessment document. Based on experience at similar sites and professional judgement, the community would probably support alternatives which control migration of ground water contaminants from beneath Dunn Field (Alternatives 2-7). The community would probably approve the alternatives which provide practically complete destruction of the toxic constituents (Alternatives 4 and 6) using treatment by UV/Oxidation. The community would probably have reservations over the estimated 90 pounds per year of VOCs that would be discharged in water from an air stripping. unit (Alternatives 2, 3, 5 and 7) even though all discharges meet substantive NPDES requirements. The community would probably have reservations over the discharge of treated water into the local POTW (Alternatives 2,3 and 4), but these reservations can be addressed through use of effective pre-treatment technologies before the water enters the sewer system. The community would probably also have reservations over the discharge of treated water into surface drainage (Alternatives 5 and 6), but these

÷

concerns can be addressed by using effective process controls, showing how small the flow is relative to natural runoff, showing the flow will remain entirely within the channel banks, and showing the discharge will have insignificant effects upon high water flows. The community will probably oppose reinjection of treated water (Alternative 7) because that action could adversely affect community water supplies if a process malfunction occurs and because that action is not permitted by current regulations. Because reinjection does not appear to offer technical advantages over the other options and because it creates community concerns, it does not warrant further consideration. A summary of these considerations is presented in Table 10.3.

						38 1	18	
		Alternative 7 Extract on site Air Stripping Re-Injection	ard down-gradient		Air emissions of 1.4 tons per year will not excood risk timits	solution until a	Variance needed to local regulation against reinjec- tion of "altered" water	s action is not an gumes.
<u>s.</u>		Alternative 6 Extract on site UV/oxidation Surf Drainage	migration of VOCs tow		VOCs destroyed by treatment process	 Treatment for other remody that is a partial 	ı [‡]	ou ce c ontrol action, thi o the Pluvial Aquifer re
		Alternative 5 Extract on site Air Stripping Surf Drainage	as. Prevents horizontal bum Field from past rel		Air emissions of 1.4 tons per year will not exceed risk limits	deral standards for VOC ired. This is an interim		the source. Without a station of contaminants interface from the burial areas.
• .	ABLE 10.3 alysis of Alternatives Page 1 of 4)	Alternative 4 Extract on site UV/oxidation POTW Disposal	l and down-gradient are r down-gradient from L		VOCs destroyed by treatment process	ant meeting state and fe Id be performed if requ		ing ground water near l is halted, off site migra colation of contaminan
	. T. Detailed An	Alternative 3 Pumps On/Off Site Air Stripping POTW Disposal	40 acres of Dunn Field Memphis Sand Aquife	Off-site wells add control over small area of down- gradient area.	Air emissions of 1.4 tons per year will not excood risk limits	is will produce an efflue 2s, such as metals, wou igned and constructed.		n objectives by controll tion. When this action loe the leaching and per
•		Alternative 2 Extract on site Air Scripping POTW Disposal	Controls VOCs beneath areas. Does not protect		Air emissions of 1.4 tons per year will not exceed risk limits	Water Treatment proces chemical specific ARAF final remedy can be desi		Achieves remedial actio effective long-term solu This action will not redu
		Alternative I No Action	Not Protective of Human Health and Environment			None		None
		Ëvaluation Criterion	Overall Protectiveness		10-12	Compliance with ARARs		Long-Term Effectiveness and Performance

.

\$1016.31/TAB)@+E/ERD&FVANger 19, 1997

118

-

ł

÷

			38 119
Alternative 7 Extract on site Air Stripping Re-Injection	Mobility of ground water contaminants beneath Dunn Field completely controlled while system operates	Toxic compounds transferred from ground water into the atmosphere	ield and off site. Reinjection up- gradient accelerates cleanup of contam- inated groundwater beneath Duun Field, but reduces cleanup but reduces off- site and down- gradient
Alternative 6 Extract on site UV/oxidation Surf Drainage	Destruction of VOCs in groundwater offers permanent reduction of toxic compounds in the environment	Volume of contami- nated ground water is reduced Dilute emissions of toxic compounds into the atmosphere are eliminated	d zone beneath Dunn Fi he system operates.
Alternative 5 Extract on site Air Stripping Surf Drainage	Mobility of ground water contaminants beneath Dunn Field completely controlled while system operates	Toxic compounds transferred from ground water into the atmosphere	40 acres of contaminate Fluvial Aquifer while 1
Alternative 4 Extract on site UV/oxidation POTW Disposal	Destruction of VOCs in groundwater offers permanent reduction of toxic compounds in the environment	Volume of contami- nated groundwater is reduced Dilute emissions of toxic compounds into the atmosphere are eliminated	un Field and captures 4 downgradient artas of
Alternative 3 Pumps On/Off Site Air Stripping POTW Disposal	er contaminants beneath controlled while system	terred from ground- ur where dilution nt volume	round water beneath Du ion of contaminants into
Alternative 2 Extract on site Air Stripping POTW Disposal	Mobility of ground wat Dunn Field completely operates	Toxic compounds transl water into the atmosphe increases the contartina	Controls contaminated a Prevents further dispers
Alternative I No Action	None		None
Evaluation Criterton	Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume	10-1	Short-term

-

TABLE 10.3 Detailed Analysis of Alternatives

(Page 2 of 4)

12

SLOIG.ZD/TABIOP-B/EE/DRFVArgua 19, 1993

-

- -

;

:

....

TABLE 10.3 Detailed Analysis of Alternatives Page 3 of 4) Alternative 3 Alternative 4 Alternative 4 Alternative 4 Alternative 3 Alternative 4 Alternatin aviti 4 <th>tive 1 Alternative 2 ction Extract on site Pu Air Stripping POTW Disposal P</th> <th>Construction of Rig extraction wells well in Dunn Field, nee involves County wat permits, but has Fiel no other special mer considerations</th> <th>Off the shelf components can extraction wells, piping, air i and other components. Equi able through multiple vendor installed by local contractors</th> <th>Capital Costs \$599,478 0&M 270,187/yr 229,</th> <th>The State would accept the er tons/yr VOCs. Carbon treat might be required to meet BD notattainment area.</th>	tive 1 Alternative 2 ction Extract on site Pu Air Stripping POTW Disposal P	Construction of Rig extraction wells well in Dunn Field, nee involves County wat permits, but has Fiel no other special mer considerations	Off the shelf components can extraction wells, piping, air i and other components. Equi able through multiple vendor installed by local contractors	Capital Costs \$599,478 0&M 270,187/yr 229,	The State would accept the er tons/yr VOCs. Carbon treat might be required to meet BD notattainment area.
ABLE 10.3 alysis of Alternatives Page 3 of 4) Alternative 4 Extract on site UV/oxidation POTW Disposal Construction of extrac special considerations special considerations and for UV treat- ment is stem. Equip- ment is stem. Equip- ment is stem. Equip- ment is stem. Equip- tion requirements not familiar with construc- tion requirements tamiliar with construc- tion requirements for state. Emission of gaseous residuals is acceptable.	T. Detailied An Alicmative 3 Pumps On/Off Site Air Stripping POTW Disposal	Right of Way for wells and piping woded to bring water into Durn Field for treat- ment	can be used for ur stripper, quipment is avail- dors, and can be ors	apital Costs 604,293 <u>86</u> M 29,327/yr	The State of Tennes : emission of 1.4 atment of emissions BDAT in an azone
	ABLE 10.3 alysis of Alternatives Page 3 of 4) Alternative 4 Extract on site UV/oxidation POTW Disposal	Construction of extract special considerations	Proprietary equipment required for UV treat- ment system. Equip- ment is available ment is available Local contractors not familiar with construc- tion requirements	Capital Costs 5825,248 0&M 303,487/yr	see will accept protection Destruction of VOCs is acceptable to state. Emission of gaseous residuals is acceptable.
	Alternative 6 Extract on site UV/oxidation Surf Drainage	ld involves County perm	Proprictary equipment required for UV treat- ment system. Equip- is available through few vendors	Capital Costs 659,398 0&M 163,500/yr	quifersame as 4
Alternative 6 Extract on site UV/voxidation Surf Drainage UV/voxidation Surf Drainage Proprietary equipment required for UV treat- ment system. Equip- its available through few vendors (Sp 398 0.8.M 163,500/yr 163,500/yr 163,500/yr 163,500/yr	Alternative 7 Extract on site Air Stripping Re-Injection	ils, but has no other	Off the shelf com- ponents used. Eqt is widely available, and can be installed by local contractorn Variance to regu- lations required	Capital Costs 498,213 0&M 149,200/yr	ame as 2 & 3
Alternative 6 Alternative 7 Extract on site UV/oxidation Surf Drainage Alternative 7 Extract on site UV/oxidation Surf Drainage Alternative 7 Involves County permits, but has no other required for UV treatmits, but has no other required for UV treatmits, but has no other ment system. Equip- is available through by local contractorn Alternative 7 Rent system Equipment few vendors Off the shelf com- net outpent off the shelf com- and can be installed by local contractorn Capital Costs Canital Costs Canital Costs Ostimal Costs Ostimal Costs Ostimal Costs Ostimal Costs Ostimal Costs Ostimal Costs ISJ,500yr 149,200/yr Al9,200/yr guifer Ostimal Costs Ostimal Costs and can Eanne as 2 & 3 same as 2 & 3				38 1	20

з,

.

.

\$1016.21/TA9;00-E/ERDEFVAnjue 19, 1993

•

•

.

۰.

-

•

÷

• •

- +

.

				•			Ċ	
			TA Detailed Ana	(BLE 10.3 lysts of Alternatives 'sgc 4 of 4)				
Evaluation Criterion	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Extract on site Air Stripping POTW Disposal	Alternative 3 Pumps On/Off Site Air Stripping POTW Disposal	Alternative 4 Extract on site UV/oxidation POTW Disposal	Alternative 5 Extract on site Afr Stripping Surf Drainage	Alternative 6 Extract on site UV/oxidation Surf Drainage	Alternative 7 Extract on site Air Suripping Re-Injection	
		The State would accept t POTW, provided the loc	the disposal of treated w al POTW accepts this d	ater into the local lischarge.	Disposal of treated wa drainage will require a periodic monitoring a Process upsets could a water and draw state	sters into surface NPDES permit and nd reporting. mpact surface enforcement.	Re-injection violates local policy for protection of public water supply in Shelby County. Special variance would be required to allow this process.	
Community Operatione	Not Acceptable	Protection of Memphis Sand Aquifer is accep- table to community.	Off-site owners may not accept extraction wells on their property	Protection of	Mcmphis Sand Aquife	r is acceptable to comm	unity.	
5		Emission of VOCs to air for possible health risks concentrations will mitig	r will create concerns or odors. Low gate concerns,	VOCs are destroyed by treatment process	Same as 2 & 3	VOCs are destroyed by treatment process.	Same as 2 & 3	3
		Disposal of reated water POTW accepts flow. Re achievable and acceptabl	r into POTW would be detentes monting MCLs vice.	acceptable if vill be fully	Disposal into surface within the community contamination, crosica Discharge of 520 gpm acceptable in the com	water creates concern for surface water n and flooding. t (1.2 cfs) is munity.	Disposal into Fluvial aquifer oreates concerns over future ground water contantination due to process upsets	8 121
Source: ES, 199	Ē							
370) 871/78	RDRFUAWINE 19, 1973					:		

.

۰.

"-

۰.

·- ···

.

11.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 Conclusions

- The pump test conducted in the northwest corner of Dunn Field in September, 1992 revealed that the Fluvial Aquifer is relatively isotrophic and has a mean hydraulic conductivity of 6.91 x 10-2 feet/minute.
- 2) Ground water in the northwest corner of Dunn Field exhibited chlorinated solvents (classified as Volatile Organic Compounds or VOCs) during the September 1992 pump test, as it had during ground water sampling for the RI/FS performed in 1989 and 1990. These VOCs are present in the Fluvial Aquifer above federal and state action levels.
- 3) Several metals, including arsenic, barium, chromium, lead, and nickel have been found above action levels in the Fluvial Aquifer beneath Dunn Field during two sampling events in 1989 and 1990. Some monitor wells exhibited one or more metals during one sampling event but not the other, indicating a variability that is not yet understood. Sampling at the pump test well in September, 1992 revealed no metals above action levels.
- 4) Permit requirements for an IRM system would include an NPDES permit for discharge to surface water. Administrative requirements that would be met through an "equivalency" process include well drilling permits, air emission permits, water treatment plant construction and operation permits, and water discharge permits.
- 5) An IRM consisting of ground water extraction in Dunn Field appears to be an appropriate action at DDRC. Such a system would provide effective control in

zones of highest VOC contamination and prevent migration off-site. This system would also provide some capture of off-site contaminants.

- 6) Technologies are available to implement an IRM at Dunn Field. Extraction using wells penetrating the Fluvial Aquifer is the most feasible control approach. Proven technologies for ground water treatment at the surface include air stripping, UV/oxidation and carbon adsorption. An IRM using these technologies can be designed to provide environmental protection, operational flexibility and cost-effectiveness.
- 7) Technologies are also available to remove metals from the extracted ground water if that is necessary. Precipitation and ion exchange are two processes that could be added to the IRM ground water treatment system to reduce the levels of metals.

11.2 Recommendations

- An Interim Remedial Measure (IRM) should be implemented to control VOC contamination in groundwater beneath the northwest corner of Dunn Field. Such a system would control ground water contamination in the vicinity of past burial trenches until more is known about the source and a permanent solution can be developed and implemented.
- 2) Another round of groundwater sampling is required to better define the nature of metals contamination in the Fluvial Aquifer beneath Dunn Field. Decisions on treatment to remove metals from ground water cannot be made until after this sampling is completed.
- 3) The recommended action is extraction within Dunn Field and treatment using air stripping, followed by discharge to surface drainage. This is Alternative 5

described in Section 8.5. Using this alternative, 520 gpm would be extracted from the Fluvial Aquifer using eight wells along the west and northwest boundaries of Dunn Field. This water would be treated using air stripping technology, which would emit about 1.4 tons per year of VOCs into the atmosphere. About 90 pounds per year of VOCs would be discharged to Cane Creek at extremely low levels that would not harm human health or the environment. This alternative is responsive to protecting human health and the environment, complying with ARARs, and is effective in the short-term. This alternative offers the fewest obstacles to implementation, is cost-effective, and appears to offer the best acceptance to the surrounding community.

.....

12.0 REFERENCES

Bonn, B., and Rounds, S., DREAM: Analytical Groundwater Flow Programs, Lewis Publishers, Inc., 1990.

Driscoll, F.G., Groundwater and Wells, second edition, 1986.

Engineering-Science, Inc. Pumping Test Technical Memorandum for Defense Distribution Region Central, Memphis, Tennessee, St. Louis, MO November, 1992b.

Graham, D.D. and Parks, W.S., Potential for leakage among principal aquifers in the Memphis Area, Tennessee, U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigation Report 85-4295, 1986.

Granger, R.A., Fluid Mechanics, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1985.

Jacob, C. E., Notes on Determining Permeability by Pumping Tests under Watertable Conditions, U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report, 1944.

Kcarney, A.T., Inc., R.F.A. Report Department of Defense Memphis Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, January, 1990.

Law Environmental, Inc., Government Services Division, Remedial Investigation Final Report Defense Depot Memphis, Tennessee, August, 1990.

McDonald, M.G., and A.W. Harbaugh, *A Modular Three-Dimensional Finite Difference Ground-Water Flow Model*, US Geological Survey, open file report 83-875, 1984.

Smith, J. W., and Z. Ishak-Muhamad. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Department Water System Contigency Study, Memphis State University, December, 1989.

ł

US Army Environmental Health Agency (USAEHA), Geohydrologic Study No. 38-26-0195-83, DDMT, Memphis, TN, 21 June - 2 July 1982.

US Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHMA), Installation Assessment of Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, March 1981.

US EPA, Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume 1: Human Health Evaluation Manual, 540/1-89/002, December 1989.

US EPA, CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual: Draft Guidance, EPA/540/G-89/006, August 8, 1988.

US EPA, CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual: Part II Clean Air Act and Other Environmental Statutes and State Requirements, EPA/540/G-89/009, August 1989.

US EPA Memorandum, Permits and Permit "Equivalency" Processes for CERCA On-Site Response Actions. OSWER Directive 9355.7-03, February 19, 1992.

US EPA, Region IV, RFI. Confirmatory Sampling and Interim Measures Work Plans, Defense Depot, Memphis TN, Letter to DDMT Commander, August 14, 1991.

.

APPENDIX A

.

:

List of Agencies and Persons Consulted

•

()

()

-

Name and Title	Affiliation	Phone Number
Jordan English Supervisor of Superfund Programs	Tennessee Division of Superfund Field Office, Memphis	901/543-6695
John Leonard Water Pollution Control	Tennessee Division of Superfund Field Office, Memphis, Tennessee	901/543-6695
Greg Parker Supervisor of Water Quality Control	Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Water Quality Control	901/576-7741
Mac Parker Air Pollution Control	Memphis-Shelby County Health Department	901/576-7741
Barry Moore Water Pollution Control	Memphis-Shelby County Health Department	901/576-7741
John Yeganeh Air Pollution Control	Memphis-Shelby County Health Department	901/576-7653
Robert Foster Assistant Director of Water Supply	Tennessee Division of Water Supply, Nashville	615/532-0155
Ed O'Neil Manager of Water Supply	Tennessee Division of Water Supply, Memphis	901/423-6600
Clure Winfrey Administrator of Wastewater Collection Facilities	City of Memphis, Environmental Maintenance	901/528-2917
Al Chokhachi Environmental Engineer	Stiles Treatment Plant, Memphis, Tennessee	901/353-2392
Rodney Thomas	Stiles Treatment Plant, Memphis, Tennessee	901/353-2392

.

ť

SL016.23/APP-A/ERDRFI/June 23, 1993

•

128 38

~

___**_**

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	Jordan English Tennessee Dept. of Superfund Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 543-6695 Date: 11-20-92 Time: 08:30 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Permits for Superfund Sites

Discussion:

Ċ.

Since DDRC is a superfund site, the initial permit process concerning time requirements for applications and fee do not apply. Superfund site permits are waived, but a letter and a completed permit application still must be submitted. If water is discharged offsite, and material is disposed offsite, then a permit for the offsite location is required.

The following contacts would be helpful for permit information:

Air Emission Permits: Contacts: John Yeganeh or Mac Parker Memphis-Shelby County Health Department (901) 576-7741

Water Monitoring/ Contacts: Greg Parker or Barry Moore Drilling Permits Memphis -Shelby County Health Department (901) 576-7741

Off-Site Disposal, Solid Waste/ Contact: Mark Thomas RCRA Permits Tennessee Division of Superfund Department of Environmental Management (901) 543-6695

NPDES Discharge Contact: John Leonard Tennessee Division of Superfund Department of Environmental Management (901) 543-6695

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	Robert Foster Assistant Director of Water Supply Nashville, TN
Phone Number:	(615) 532-0155 Date: 11-20-92 Time: 10:00 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Federal MCL's

Discussion:

·

Mr. Foster verified that the State of Tennessee Guidelines are equivalent to the Federal MCLs for drinking water.

.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	Greg Parker Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 576-7741 Date: 11-25-92 Time: 11:30 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Water Well Permits

Discussion:

· · · · ·

The Memphis-Shelby County Health Department requires a well permit for recovery wells or similar purposes. Mr. Parker will fax the Well Application Form.

The Department has a rule prohibiting reinjection wells. ES is considering an alternative that might use reinjection into the same formation. Mr. Parker explained that to date, variances to this rule have never been granted.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	Al Chockhachi Public Works Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 353-2392 Date: 11-30-92 Time: 09:15 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Location of Sewer Lines

Discussion:

6

;

The location and diameter of the sewer lines located in the Dunn Field area are as follows:

Kyle Street, west side of DDRC, pipe has an 8 inch diameter line.

Hays Street has an 8 inch line which turns into a 10 inch line at Person Street.

A 36" diameter line is located south of the creek at Person and Regeon Street. A manhole is located near that intersection. The pipe goes northeast, along the creek and crosses the creek and ends up at Oaklawn Street.

- -

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	Clure Winfrey Administrator of Wastewater Collection Facilities, City of Memphis Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 528-2917 Date: 11-30-92 Time: 10:30 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Sewer Lines

Discussion:

Al Chockhachi, Pre-treatment Coordinator with Public Works, authorizes approval to hook up into the sewer system/line connected to the South Treatment Plant. (901) 353-2392.

+

.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	John Yeganeh Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 576-7741 Date: 12-09-92 Time: 10:30 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Operating and Construction Permits

Discussion:

Memphis-Shelby County has adopted the State of Tennessee Air Code Regulations. The Code Number for an operating permit is:

Section 16-77 Reference 1200-3-9-.02

The Construction Permit Air Pollution Code Number:

Section 16-77 Reference 1200-3-9-.01

The Construction permit costs \$200.00. The Operating permit costs \$50.00 a year if the discharge is less than 25 tons per year. It takes 90 days or less for the permitting process to be approved.

.

.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	Al Chokhachi Public Works Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 353-2392 Date: 12-15-92 Time: 1:45 PM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: South Treatment Plant

Discussion:

ι.

The South Treatment Plant, Memphis, Tennessee is currently handling 65 million gallons per day. The Plant has the capacity to treat up to 80 million gallons per day.

Volumetric Charge for disposal into the sanitary sewer:

- a) \$0.5868* cents per 1,000 gallons if:
 BOD is below 255 ppm

 - Suspended solids are below 300 ppm
- b) \$0.5868 + \$0.27 cents per pound if BOD is above 255ppm.
- c) \$0.5868 + .46 cents per pound if suspended solids are above 300 ppm
- * includes no added treatment charge

A meter must be installed to record monthly volumetric discharge rates.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

- Phone Call From: Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
 - Phone Call To: John Yeganeh Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Memphis, TN

Phone Number: (901) 576-7741 Date: 12-17-92 Time: 09:30 AM

Project: Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Air Emission Permits

Discussion:

The two treatment processes that are under consideration are the UV/Oxidation process and the Air Stripper unit. Both processes must file for a construction/operation permit. The state will decide if the UV/Oxidation would be exempt from the permit, based on the technology. Based on air stripper technology, there are no air quality standards for VOCs and therefore each unit/stripper is handled on a case by case basis. Each application is based on "Best Available Control Technology (BACT)".

The Air-quality Control Region of Memphis is Region #18. The status for the pollutants in the Memphis area is as follows. In October 1992, documents were sent to EPA Region IV to obtain approval for designating carbon monoxide at attainment levels for Memphis-Shelby County. These documents are currently under review by the EPA. In November 1992, documents were sent to EPA Region IV for review on the ozone levels for Memphis-Shelby County. EPA is currently reviewing the documents. Lead, ozone, and carbon monoxide levels for Memphis-Shelby County are currently at non-attainment levels until EPA approves the new application.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	John Yeganeh Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 576-7741 Date: 6-8-93 Time: 02:30 PM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Air Emission Permits for Toxic Air Pollutants

Discussion:

The regulation for Toxic Air Pollutants is the State of Tennessee Air Pollution Code Section 16-81 Ref. 1200 3-11. The toxic air pollutants referenced are as follows:

> Asbestos Beryllium Mercury Vinyl Chloride Benzene Radionuclides Inorganic Arsenic

At this time, Tennessee air regulations do not contain a Toxic Air Pollutant Clause for other VOCs. The State could possibly adopt such a clause by 1995.

The BACT requirement in Memphis-Shelby County for VOC sources is handled on a case by case basis. For a release of approximately 2 to 2.5 tons a year from an air stripper treatment system, there is no control requirement for BACT. The emission rate that BACT applies to is handled on a case by case basis.

The Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Pollution Control Section determines the type of VOC monitoring that is required for an Air Stripper or UV unit. For a discharge of approximately 2 to 2.5 tons per year, the monitoring could be daily, monthly, or every 6-months. Each discharge situation is handled on a site by site basis.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	John Leonard Tennessee Division of Superfund Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 543-6695 Date: 06-14-93 Time: 09:30 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Amendments To An Existing NPDES Permit

Discussion:

. . .

The existing DDRC NPDES permit would need to be amended if:

a) an additional discharge point is added;

b) the type of water to be discharged is not covered in the existing permit. The current DDRC NPDES permit regulates stormwater and non-contact cooling discharges. Treated groundwater is considered process discharge, which is not included in the existing permit. Flow characteristics for the process discharge are required;

c) new parameters are to be discharged. This would also require new sampling criteria and total analysis. Additional monitoring requirements would be included.

The time requirement for amending the permit is approximately 90 to 100 days and could include public hearings. There is no fee to amend the current permit since there is an existing fee which is paid monthly.

If the current NPDES is to be amended, then a letter must be written, stating the changes to the existing permit and the reason for the changes.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Cail To:	John Yeganeh Memphis-Shelby County Health Department Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 576-7741 Date: 6-16-93 Time: 09:30 AM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Air Emission Permits

Discussion:

C

EPA is currently reviewing an application to redesignate Memphis-Shelby County as an attainment area for ozone. When an area is under reclassification the current State Implementation Plan (SIP) must be updated. The State of Tennessee SIP is in the process of revision.

While the SIP is under revision, ozone precursor requirements have been adopted by reference from the State of Tennessee Pollution Control Guidelines. The ozone precursor requirements are specified in Section 1200-3-18-.02 and state that a VOC is any organic compound which participates in atmospheric photochemical reactions. VOCs that do not participate in atmospheric photochemical reactions are labeled nonreactive organic compounds.

NOTES OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Phone Call From:	Bari Siegel Engineering-Science, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63017 (314) 576-7330
Phone Call To:	Al Chokhachi/ Pre-treatment Coordinator Public Works Memphis, TN
Phone Number:	(901) 353-2392 Date: 6-17-93 Time: 03:00 PM
Project:	Defense Distribution Region Central Memphis, Tennessee Interim Remedial Measure for Ground Water SL016.22

Subject: Water Discharge/South Treatment System

Discussion:

(

The water discharged into the sewer system at DDRC is metered through Memphis Light and Gas. To obtain the sewer rate charge per month at DDRC, call the Sewer Fee Department in Memphis with the DDRC sewer account number.

Approximately 70,000 gallons of waste water (water from the pump test 8/92) at Dunn Field will be discharged to the South Treatment Plant also called the T.E. Maxon Facility. A fee of \$0.5868 cents per 1,000 gallons of waste water will be charged to DDRC.

APPENDIX B

MEMPHIS-SHELBY COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL GUIDELINES SECTION 1200-3-18-.02

ï

009 W400140 68-91-90

1

1200-3-18-.02 DEFINITIONS

- Unless specifically defined in this Chapter, the definitions from 1200-3-2 will apply:
 - (a) "Volatile Organic Compound (VOC)" means any organic compound which participates in atmospheric photochemical reactions. VOC may be measure by a reference method, an equivalent method, an alternative method, or by procedures specified under 40 CPR Part 60 (revised as of July 1, 1990). A reference method, an equivalent method, or an alternative method, however may also measure nonreactive compounds. In such cases, an owner or operator may exclude the nonreactive organic compounds when determining compliance with a standard. The following compounds will not be considered volatile

Methane Ethane Methylene chloride Methyl chloroform (1,1,1-trichloroethane) Trichlorofluoromsthane (CFC-11) Dichlorofluoromethane (CPC-12) Chlorodifluoromethane (CFC-22) Trifluorometnane (PC-23) Trichlorotrifluoroethene (CFC-113) Dichlorotetrafluoroethane (CFC-114) Chloropentafluorosthane (CFC-115) Dichlorotrifluoroethane (ACFC-123) Tetrafluoroethanc (HCPC-134a) Dichlorofluoroethane (HCFC-141b) Chlorodifluorocthane (HCPC-142b) 2-Chloro-1,1,1,2 - Tetrafluoroethane (HCPC-124) Pentafluoroethane (HFC-125) 1,1,2,2 - Tetrafluoroethane (HFC-134) 1,1,1 - Trifluorethane (HPC-143a) 1,1 - Difluorethane (SFC-152a)

Perfluorocarbon compounds in the following four classes:

Cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated alkanes Cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated athers with no unsaturations Cyclic, branched, or linear, completely fluorinated tertiary amines with no unsaturations Sulfur containing perfluorocarbons with no insaturations and with sulfur bonds only to carbon and fluorine

(b) "Exampt solvent" means any compound that is exampted under: the definition of "Volatile Organic Compound (VOC)"

THA DB 12:57 WEHE SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPT.

P. 273

APPENDIX C

FEBRUARY 5, 1991. LETTER SENT TO THE GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE FROM THE REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR OF EPA REGION IV

.

Ļ

1

1


DEC 17 (92_11:25 MPHS, SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPT, 38

• • • • • • • • •

.

P.2/13 D UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCE FEB

144

REGION IV

345 COURTLAND STREET, N.S. ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30365

FEB 5 1991

4APT/AP8

÷

.:

21 C. 1814

Honorable Ned McWherter Governor of Tennessee State Capitol Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Dear Governor McWherter:

To follow up the letter to you from Assistant Administrator William G. Rosenberg, dated December 13, 1990, concerning the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990, I want to describe several specific State actions that must be completed or started soon to implement the monattainment provisions of Title I. Some of these actions are associated with especially short schedules.

Over the next few weeks and months, each State must define its nonattainment areas and begin the development and adoption of new . controls in accordance with the Amendments. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), while developing and implementing new control initiatives at the national level, will support your State efforts by providing a number of guidance materials and conducting a scries of workshops on selected topics. The Regional Office will continue to work directly with your State air agency director and stail to communicate the new requirements and the guidance and other assistance to be provided by EPA.

The following paragraphs discuss in detail various Title I requirements that apply to erone, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), and lead air pollutants. The discussion will include both areas designated nonattainment at the time of enactment and new areas.

Designations/Classifications/Boundary Determinations Ι.

The letter from Assistant Administrator William G. Rosenborg to you, dated December 13; 1990, (Assistant Administrator Letter) described in a general rashion the State actions that will be needed to determine the designations, classifications, and boundary determinations for areas in your State. This letter will describe those actions in more detail, and provide a blueprint for specific actions you need to take with respect to your areas.

Printed on Accycled Peper

.

Semilar particular appropriate modifications) no later than 240 days from

A. <u>Ozone and CO Areas</u>

1. <u>Overview</u>

۰.

which is the manufacture of the

In general, the 1990 CAAA require each State to submit to EPA by March 15, 1991, (120 days after enactment), a list of all areas in the State, indicating designations (artainment, nonattainment, or unclassifiable) for orone or CO (or aftirming existing designations) and describing their boundaries. It is not lawful, through this process, to reduce any existing boundaries of orone or CO nonattainment areas, and thereby redesignate an area from nonattainment to artainment. EPA intends to act on the list by promulgating new or affirmed designations, classifications, and boundaries by no later than July 13, 1991 (no later than 120 days after receipt of the State list is required). If EPA chooses to modify the State list (including, for example, modify the boundaries), EPA must notify the State by notify the boundaries), EPA must notify the State by notify the boundaries of days prior to EPA promulgation).

-2-

EPA interprets the new Act to require two basic procedures for designating, classifying, and determining the boundaries for upone and CO areas ... First, as of the date of enactment, designations occurred by operation of law on the basis of current designations. In other words, areas formally designated as monattairment before enacument were again designated as nonattainment by operation of law. In addition, areas that were designated constrainment upon enactment were classified at that time on the basis of 1987-89 data, in the case of erone, and 1988-89 data, in the case of CO. These classifications, in turn, triggered (1) the 45-day metropolitan statistical area (MSA)/ consolidated metropolitan statistical area (CMSA) process described in the Assistant Administrator Letter for ozone and CO nonattainment areas that were classified upon enactment as serious, severe, or extreme; (ii) the 90-day opportunity for the Administrator to consider adjusting the classification for nonattainment areas under the 5 percent provision; and (iii) the requirement for submission of corrections to current State rules representing reasonably available control technologies (RACT) in orone nonattainment areas by May 15, 1991.

Second, additional designations, classifications, and boundary-setting will occur through the State submission of a list of areas in the State at 120 days from enactment (March 15, 1991), and EPA promulgation of that list (with appropriate modifications) no later than 240 days from

13-17-32 11:45AM POB

- 3 -

enactment (July 13, 1991). This 240-day process may result in the addition of new nonattainment designations for some areas not proviously designated nonattainment, and the expansion of the boundaries of some areas that were designated nonattainment as of the date of enactment. Areas newly designated to nonattainment at this 240-day process will be classified, and their classification will in turn trigger (1) the 45-day process described in the Assistant Administrator Letter for exons or CO nonattainment areas classified as serious, severe, or extreme; and (ii) the 90-day opportunity for the Administrator to consider adjusting the classification for ozone nonattainment areas under the 5 percent provision.

2. <u>Requirements</u> for Specific Areas

a. Pro-enectment Nonattainment Areas

Under the 1990 CAAA, as of the date of enactment (November 15, 1990), Memphis and Nashville were designated nonattainment for come and Memphis was designated nonattainment for CO by operation of law. These are areas designated nonattainment under 40 CPR part 81 (the designation tables). In addition, each area became classified in accordance with 1987-89 air. quality data for ozone, and 1988-89 data for CO.

The following table identifies each pre-enactment ozone and/or CO nonattainment area in your State, its relevant air quality data, and its classification as of the date of enactment:

Table 1: Ozone

	<u>Namo</u> o <u>f</u> Arca	<u>1997-89</u> <u>Pesian</u> <u>Value</u>	<u>Classification</u>
¥	Memphis	0.140	Moderate
	Nashville	0.138	Moderate

t

÷04

11. HEAM

Moderate

Memphis

<u>Tahla 7: CO</u>

9.6

<u>Name</u> Q <u>f</u> Area	<u>1988-89</u> <u>Design</u> Value	<u>Classification</u>
-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------

A9 indicated in tables 1 and 2, the Memphis and Nashville areas were classified, as of the date of enactmont, as marginal or moderate for ozone, and the Memphis srea was classified as moderate for CO. As previously stated, the State is required to submit a list of all ozone and/or CO areas in the State, designating them and describing their boundaries by March 15, 1991. EPA will promulgate the list by no later than July 13, 1991. In determining the boundaries, the State should consider a wide range of factors, including population, population density, growth patterns, commuting patterns, commercial development, industrial development, topographic and meteorological conditions, and pollution or precursor area for boundaries for ozone and CO nonattainment areas should be the MSA/CMSA.

As indicated in the Assistant Administrator Letter, if the design value of any of your ozonc (and/or CO) areas is within 5% of the cut-off for another (higher or lower) classification, your State may request that the area be reclassified to the other classification. A December 19, 1990, letter has been received from your State air director requesting that both Kemphis and Nashville be reclassified as marginal ozons nonattainment areas. The Agency will be evaluating a number of criteria including 1990 air quality data, air quality trends, growth projections, and emission trends in making its final decision on the Memphis and Nashvillo classifications. EPA must make any such reclassification by February 12, 1991. We will evaluate your request and, shortly after February 13, 1991, notify you of the decision.

b. <u>Areas Not Designated Nonattainment as of the Date</u> <u>of Enactment</u>

10

. . .

Tennessee has the Knoxville ozone area, no portion of which was designated nonattainment prior to the enactment of the 1990 ChAA. EPA expects that the following new area will be designated constrainment and classified based on the relevant air quality data:

-\$-

		<u>Table 3: Ozone</u>	
. .	<u>)3206</u> 77 7205	<u>1987-89</u> Design Value	<u>Classification</u>
	Rnorville	0.135	Marginal

As previously indicated, the State is required to submit a list of all ozone and/or CO areas in the State, designating them and describing their boundaries by March 15, 1991. EPA will promulgate the list by no later than July 13, 1991. In determining the boundaries, the State should consider a wide range of factors, including population, population density, growth patterns sconguting patterns, commercial development industrial development, topographic and mateorological conditions, and pollution or precursor transport in defining the boundaries. The default area for boundaries for ozone and CO norattainment areas should be the MSA/CMSA.

Additionally, it should be noted that Smyth County, Virginia, which is adjacent to the Johnson City, Tennessee, MSA, has monitored violations of the ambient air quality standard for ezone and will likely be redesignated to nonattainment. Since Smyth County is rural, possible transport contribution to the monitored violations is being evaluated. Should that evaluation indicate that the Johnson City area is contributing to these violations, the monattainment area could be expanded to include all or part of the MSA. EPA will ensure that the State air agency is kept informed of any pertinent developments regarding this issue.

12-17-12

11:33AM

PDS

B. <u>Sulfur Dioride Areas</u>

ι.

<u>Designations and Boundaries</u>

P.5/13

In 1971, when EPA promulgated the ambient SO₂ standards, it designated areas nonattainment, attainment, or unclassifiable. Any area in your State designated as not attaining the SO₂ standard as of the date of enactment of the 1990 CAAA (November 15, 1990) is designated by operation of law as a nonattainment area under the 1990 CAAA. The following lists the counties in your State which are nonattainment areas:

<u>Area</u>

-6-

Benton and Humphreys Counties (TVA New Johnsonville)

Polk County

Section 107 of the CAAA, requires the State to submit SO2 designations 120 days from date of notification by 22A. However, I encourage you to submit your designations for these areas by March 15, 1991, along with the submittal for ozone. If you submit them within this period, EPA will make every effort to promulgate combined designations by July 13, 1991. In any event, I am requesting that you achier your domignations not lates them 12t days from the date of this letter.

<u>Sulfur Dioxide SIP Requirements</u>

For any areas in your State designated as nonattainment as of the data of enactment for SO₂, but lacking a fully approved plan, the State must submit a SIP to EPA within 18 months of the date of enactment. For these existing nonattainment ercas, this requires revising the SIP to include additional controls as needed to provide for attainment. To develop and implement these controls, a number of important activities must be completed or started to maet the 18-month from the date of enactment requirement specified in the legislation. For example, actions must be initiated quickly to collect pollutant emissions data, conduct air quality modeling, and adopt specified control measures. The SIP must provide for attainment of the SO₂ standard as expeditionsly as practicable but no later than five years from the date of enactment.

Both of the existing SO_2 nonattainment areas do have fully approved plans. However, there are indications that there may have been recent violations of the SO_2 standard in the Polk County area. The data is currently undergoing

12-17-01 11:36AM P06

evaluation which may result in a requirement for the State to submit a revised plan for that area.

-7-

The above-mentioned SIP must meet all Clean Air Act requirements for implementation plans identified in section 172(c) of the CAAA, and 40 CPR Part 51. Guidance on these requirements was previously provided to your State Air Division (Sulfur Dioxide - 2PA-450/2-89-019). These plan requirements include, but are not limited to, the implementation of all reasonably available control measures needed for attainment, provisions for reasonable further progress, completion of an emissions inventory, provisions for the permitting of new or modified sources which meet the requirements of section 173, and compliance with the additional requirements of section 110(a)(2) of the CAA, as

C. Lead Areas

1. Designations and Boundaries

In 1978, when MPA promulgated the ambient lead standard, it was not authorized to classify areas nonottainment, attainment, or unclassifiable. Under section 107(d)(S) of the CAAA, EPA is now authorized to require the State to designate areas in the State as nonattainment, attainment, or unclassifiable for lead.

Based upon the available information, SPA believes the following areas should be designated as invitated below

ATHA		Designation
Shelby County	•	Monattainment
Williamson County		Nonattainment
Fayette County	•	Unclassifiable

This determination is based on the ambient air monitoring data coatained is an enclosed table entitled "Tennessco Lead MAAOS exceedances for 1988 AND 1989." Please consider the data contained in that table prior to submitting your designations to EPA. There is not sufficient quality assured ambient air data to determine the attainment status of Fayotta County. Once deequate data is obtained, the attainment status for Fayette County will be reevaluated. Further guidance on determining specific boundaries is

11:45AM PO2

12-17-53

P.2/8

. .

÷.,

beirg provided to the State air director Section 107(d)(h) and (d)(5) of the cana, permits EPA to require the State to submit Tead designations as EPA may deem (reasonable, but no sooner than 120 days from the date of notification. I encourage you to submit your designations for these areas by March 15, 1991, along with the submittal for ozone and CO. . If you submit them within this period, ... EPA will make every effort to promulgate combined designations by July 13, 1991. In any event, I am requiring that you submit your designations not later than 120 days from the date of this letter.

-8-

2. Lead SIP Requirements

Any State containing an area designated as nonattainment for lead must submit a SIP to EPA within 18 months of the nonattainment designation. The SIP must provide for attainment of the lead standard as expeditiously as practicable, but no later than five years from the date of the nonattainment designation. 29A intends to complete the nonattainment designations in the third quarter (calendar) of 1991. Therefore, we expect that lead SIPs will be due in the first quarter (calendar) of 1993. Actainment dates, for these nonattainment areas, should be no later than the third quarter (calendar) of 1996.

The shove mentioned SIP must meet all the requirements for implementation plans identified in section 72(c) of the CANA, and 40 CPR part 51. These plan requirements include, but are not limited to, the implementation of all reasonably available control measures needed for Atlainment, provisions for reasonable further progress, provisions for the permitting of new or modified sources which meet the requirements of section 173, and compliance with the additional requirements of section 110(a)(2) of the CAAA.

II. <u>Outstanding SIP Calls (Notices of SIP Inadequacy)</u>

As you may recall, on May 26, 1988, and November 8, 1989, I notified you by letter that the SIPs for the areas listed in Tables 1 and 3 were substantially inadequate to provide for timely attainment of the relevant NAAOS under section 110(a)(2)(H) of the Clean Air Act. EPA stated that Kentucky should respond in two phases to produce SIPS that would be adequate to attain and maintain the standards. Phase I asked you, among other things to update your emission inventories and make corrections in regulations imposing RACT on existing stationary sources. (See discussion below concerning RACT corrections.) Phase II would include a full attainment demonstration with supporting regulations. You were advised that you could delay submitting Phase

12-17-92 01:45AM 203 The Assistant Administrator's Lotter stressed the importance of reviewing current State rules and procedures to ensure that they were consistent with national policies and guidance and that maximum benefit was being derived from the existing air pollution control program. This step would also ensure that a solid foundation was established for subsequent rule development and adoption. The focus of this effort would be correcting RACT rules in accordance with previous notifications and correcting motor vehicle inspection and maintenance (1/K) programs where necessary.

A. BACT Corrections

On May 26, 1988, and on November 8, 1989, I notified you that specific action was needed to correct deficiencies in the Tennessee regulations representing RACT for sources of volatile organic compounds (VOC). A list of those deficiencies has been provided to your State air agency. My staff is presently coordinating with your State air agency staff to complete therequired corrections. I encourage you to make the necessary corrections to the RACT rules as soon as possible. The 1990 CAAA require that these corrections must be completed and submitted to EPA no later than May 15, 1991.

B. I/H Corrections -

The 1990 CAAA require states that were required to or have already implemented I/M programs to submit an immediate SIP revision providing for measures to correct deficiencies that may exist in these programs. <u>Mag a result</u> of an cudit on May 14-16, 1990, the I/M program in Mamphia appears not to her in compliance with either the commitmentagin the SIP or with EPA's minimum program requirements. Thus it is likely that corrections to the Memphis program will be necessary.

The I/M program in Nashville is currently meeting the commitments contained in the 1982 SIP revisions and EPA's current policy requirements. The CAAA of 1990 require EPA to revisit and republish I/M policy, however, which may result in the need for SIP revisions to meet any new requirements.

EPA will be confirming its assessment of the Memphis and Nashville program designs and performance and revisiting the apecific policy requirements for basic and enhanced I/M

11-17-91 11:45AM - 804

programs, in consultation with state and local officials and other interested parties. This work will be completed as quickly as possible. We will forward the updated requirements to you as soon as they are completed. In the moantime, in order to comply with the spirit of the law, I ask that you make a formal commitment in writing by the end of February to pursue corrections to the programs according to the terms of the new policy, once the policy is issued. My staff will be ready to assist yours in developing the specific changes that will be necessary.

-20-

III. Pending Redogignation Requests

With respect to your pending section 107 redesignation requests for Polk County and the New Johnsonville areas for SO₂, I fully recognize that EPA has not completed action on your submittals. However, new provisions in the amended Act modify what states need to submit in their redesignation requests and supply new requirements that must be met before EPA may approve the request. The amendments har redesignation under the present circumstances because Tennessee has not met these requirements.

Specifically, under the Amended Act, EPA is obligated to approve or disapprove a State redesignation submittal within eighteen months of the agency's receipt of a complete submittal [section 107(d)(3)(D)]. The amendments prohibit SPA from approving a redesignation request that does not demonstrate that: (1) the area has attained the NAAQS; (2) EPA has fully approved the SIP; (3) the area's improvement in air quality is due to permanent and enforceable emission reductions resulting from implementation of the SIP; (4) the State has submitted and EPA has approved a maintenance plan meeting the requirements of section 175A; and (5) the State has met all the requirements applicable to the area under section 110 and Part D.

In light of these prerequisites to SPA approval, EPA is hereby notifying Tennessee that its redesignation requests for those areas are incomplete. At a minimum, the requests lack a ten-year maintenance plan for either area, as described in section 175A. In addition, with respect to the Polk County request, as previously mentioned there may have been recent violations of the SO₂ standard. Until the review of the data is complete, we cannot advise you as to the specific changes which may be required for that area. With respect to the request for the New Johnsonville area, it was not proceased due to the Stack Height Remand. My staff will be working with your State air agency staff to determine what will be needed to finalize the redesignation.

IV. EPA Guidance Materials

i

. 1 12-17-22 1.15AM PCE

-17-92

11:45AM

PDG

12

The EPA has developed a number of guidance materials to support States as they revise their SIDS. Enclosed is a list of currently available and planned guidance ... One document listed, "Getting Started on the Title I Requirements, " will provide an overview of the early State submittal requirements and a summary of the related guidance to be provided by EPA. We will keep your State air director apprised of other support activities, such as national workshops on selected topics and issues.

.

-11--

I am sure you will agree that the Clean Air Act Amendments have presented a substantial challenge to Shate and Federal agencies and officials responsible for implementing the many new provisions. This challenge also comes with a unique opportunity to achieve some of the nation's most difficult air quality goals that, despite the broad range of formidable afforts of the past, have remained beyond our grasp. I look forward to continuing the strong, cooperative relationship between your State and EPA as we face these exciting new challenges and opportunities.

Sincerely yours,

Juer L.

Greer C. Tidwell Regional Administrator

Enclosures

cc: Harold Hedges Paul Bontrager Terry Harris Dennis Fritchie.

: ı

į

:

: -

;

.

DEC 17 '92 11:35 MPHS. SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPT. TEXNESSEE LEAD NAAOS EXCEEDANCES FOR 1988 AND 1989.

values are in ng/m³

•	lat quarter	2nd quarter	3zd quarter	4th quartes
shelby County	••••			
	Monitor #	47-157-004	4	
1989	*			4.43
Villiamson County				
	Monitor 1	47-187-010	2	
1908	0.66	1.25	1.61	0,54
	Monitor #	47-187-110)1	
1988	1.15	1.68	1.97	1.42

no data available

.

12-17-92 11:48AM 207

P.7/8

:

APPENDIX D

PERMIT FORMS AND REQUIREMENTS

¢

1

3

ł,

t

.....

Permit Forms and Requirements

1. Well Application Form

1

- 2. Construction and Operating Air Control Application
- 3. NPDES "Application for Permit to Discharge Process Wastewater"
- 4. City of Memphis, Division of Public Works "Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit" Application
- 5. Rules of "Tennessee Department of Health and Environment Bureau of Environment Division of Air Pollution Control" Chapter 1200-3-9 Construction and Operating Permits
- 6. Section 13 of "Rules and Regulations Memphis County Groundwater Quality Control Board of Shelby County"
- 7. Section 6 of "Rules and Regulations Memphis County Groundwater Quality Control Board of Shelby County"

- .

WELL APPLICATION FORM

.

(⁴-,

.

- -----

WELL APPLICATION FORM SECTIONS I, II, II, AND IX MUST BE COMPLETELY FILLED OUT BY THE WELL DRILLER. APPLICANT AND DRILLER MUST SID APPLICATION. IRTLIER. APPLICANT AND DRILLER MUST SID APPLICATION. I. WELL OWNER NAME OR ESTABLISHMENT. CONTACT MANDE: MALLING ALGAESS: CITY: STATE: II. WELL LOCATION MODESYS WELL IS APPROX. MALL IS APPROX. MILES N S E W OF KATER PRODUCTION MALL IS APPROX. MILL TYPE WELL TO BE DWILLED BERNIER MALL IS APPROX. MALL IS APPROX. MALL IS APPROX. MILL IS APPROX. MATER PRODUCTION BERNIER BERNIER CONNER BERNIER MATER PRODUCTION BERNIER BERNIER CONDANTON BERNIER STATE DENTITION BERNIER BERNIER MATER PRODUCTION BERNIER BERNIER STATE <	V 25 ′92 11:	58 MPHS. SHELB	Y COUNTY JEAL Pollition C Water Quali 814 Jeff MEMPHIS 901-	IH DEPIMANTH ONTROL SECTIO TY ROOM 438- ERSON AVENUE , TN 38105 576-7741	DEPARIMENT N L	P.7
I. WELL OWNER NAME OF ESTABLISHMENT: CONTACT NAME: MALLING ADDRESS: CITW: PHONE EUCINEES II. WELL COATION ADDRESS: MELL IS APPROX	SECTIONS OWNER: SY	I, II, III, A CTIONS IV THR RILLER, APPL	WELL APPL ND IX MUST U VIII MUST ICANT AND DI	ICATION PORM BE COMPLETELY BE COMPLETELY NILLER MUST SI	FILLED OUT BY T FILLED OUT BY ' GN APPLICATION.	HE WELL The Well
NAME OR NAME OF ESTABLISHMENT: CONTACT NAME: MALLING ADDRESS: CITY: PHOME EUGINEES II. WELL LOCATION ADDRESS: WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPROXNO C. UNDERLIED WATER PRODUCTIONRD. OR S C. UNDERLIES SPECIFYD. MONDO C. UNDER IS SPECIFYD. MONDO IV. WELL DRILLER DRILLING COMPANY: NEW WELLNEW WELL NEW WELLNEMPROX NEW WELLREPLACEMENT MEN WELLREPLACEMENT MEN WELLREPLACEMENT MEN WELLREPLACEMENT MEN WELLREPLACEMENT MEN WELLREPLACEMENT MEN WELLSDECIFY			I. WI	LL OWNER		
CONTACT NAME:	NAME OR MA	ME OF ESTABLE	SHMENT		·	_
MALLING ALGARESS: STATE: ZID: PHONE EUSINEZS HEME II. WELL LOCATION ADDRESS: MELL LOCATION ADDRESS: MELL LOCATION ADDRESS: MELL IS APPROX. MILES N S E W OF RELL INFERPROX. MILES N S E W OF RO. OR S WELL IS APPROX. MILES N S E W OF RO. OR S WATER PROJUCTION MUNITORING a Groundwater gualicy WATER PROJUCTION MUNITORING a Groundwater gualicy WATER PROJUCTION MUNITORING a Groundwater gualicy BEATERING	CONTACT NA	শহ:			тг, <u>е</u> :	
CITY:	MAILING AS	GAE55:		·		<u>-</u>
PHONE ELDINESS HCME II. MELL LOCATION ADDRESS MILED N S E W OF RD. OR S WELL IS APPEOX. MILED N S E W OF RD. OR S WELL IDENTIFICATION * LAND SIZE IN ACREC WATER PRODUCTION MOUNITORING DEWATER PRODUCTION MOUNITORING BEALTRING MONITORING CHER Communicater quality SOIL BORING	CITY:			TATE:		
II. WELL LOCATION II. WELL LOCATION II. WELL LOCATION ADDRESS: WELL IS APPEOXMILES N S E W OFRD. OR S WELL IS APPEOXMILES N S E W OFRD. SIZE IN ACRES ULL TO BE DRILLEDWATER PRODUCTIONNOUNITORINGNOUNITORINGNOUNITORINGNOUNDATER GUAJICYNOUNTORINGNOUNDATER GUAJICYRETOWERYNOUNDATER GUAJICYNOUNTORINGNOUNDATER GUAJICYNOUNTORINGNOUNDATER GUAJICYNOUNDATER PRODUCTIONNOUNDATER GUAJICYNOUNTORINGNOUNDATER GUAJICYNOUNDATER GUAJICY	PHONE EL:	SINE25		-	ZAR:	
ADDRESS RD. OR S WELL IS APPROX. MILEO N S E W OF RD. OR S WELL IS APPROX. MILEO N S E W OF RD. OR S WELL IS APPROX. MILEO N S E W OF RD. OR S WELL IS APPROX. MILEO N SIZE IN ACREC RD. OR S WELL IS APPROX. MILEO N SIZE IN ACREC III. TYPE WELL TO BE DRILLED WATER PRODUCTION MONITORING MONITORING DEMATERING MONITORING SCILBORING SOIL BORING MONITORING SCILBORING OTHER SOIL BORING SCILBORING SPECIFY STATE Chemical movement JULY. STATE: ZIP: V. TYPE OF WORK REPLACEMENT MEN WELL REPLACEMENT MEN WELL REPLACEMENT MENNELL STATE MENNEL STATE MEN WELL REPLACEMENT MENNEL STATE MENNEL SPECIFY		· · · ·				
III. TYPE WELL TO BE DRILLED	ADDEESS	HOXMILEO	N S E	W OF	R	
IV. WELL DRILLER DRILLING COMPANY: TPANESSEE WELL DRILLER LICENSE #: AEPRESENTATIVE: AAILING ADDRESS: V. TYPE OF WORK NEW WELL NEW WELL REPLACEMENT REPLACEMENT REPAIR SPECIFY	WATER DENAT RETOW SOIL OTHER SPECT	PRODUCTION ERING ERY BORING	1. TYPE WEL	L TO BE DRILLI	ED DRING H. Groundwater g Mothane gas Water level Leachate Gas movement Chemical anver Other:	uality Mént
DRILLING COMPANY:			IV. WELL	DRILLER	<u>-</u>	·
TPANESSEE WELL DRILLER LIGENSE #:	DRILLING CO	M2ANY:			·	
ALE AND ABANDON OTHER SPECIFY	TENNESSEE W	NUL ORIZZER LI	ICENSE #:			
AILING ADDRESS:	CPRESENTAT	TVE:		PriO	NE1	
V. TYPE OF WORK NEW WELL NEW WELL REPLACEMENT REPAIR FILL AND ABANDON OTHER SPECIFY	AILING ADD	RESS:			<u> </u>	
V. TYPE OF WORK	DITY;		STATE:	ZIP		••
NEW WELLREPLACEMENT REPAIR FILL AND ABANDONOTHER SPECIFY			V. TYPE	OF WORK		·
	NEW	WELL RK		_ REPLACEMENT		
	Ft20	, and thereaters		SPECIFY		

-

•

(

:

.

.

i

:

:

÷

.

•

:

. ..

-

, 25 '92 11:59 MFHS. SHELBY COU		CHICH INF	ORMATIC	on		
1. EXPECTED DEPTH OF WELL: 2. WELL CASING: TYPE MATER 3. TYPE OF WATER PUMPING.E	FT. FT. OUIP.:SUB	CONSTRUC DIAMETE MESSIBLE	T'ION R/ R	ATER SOU WALL T	RCS: HICKNESS TURBINE	
VII. H	ONITORING	WELL THE				_
1. NUMBER OF WELLS NEEDED: 2. SUBSTANCES TO BE MONITO 2. SAMPLING METHOD TO BE U 4. HOW OFTEN 13 WELL TO BE	P RED FOR: SED: BAIL	NOPOSED D	EPTM OF	WELL(S):	. <u>.</u> .
	SAMPLEDY		<u> </u>			_
VI RESIDENTIAL REAT PUMP RETAIN DAKE LEVEL	II. WATE COMMERCI SPRINK OT	R WELL US AL LER SYSTEM HER (SPEC)	ACE INC M IFY!	NUSTRIAL 	IRAIC	_FAR: A T TO
IX. ADDI:	TIONAL IN	FORMATION	REQUIR	ED		
B. \$25.00 PROCESSING FEE C. ALL WELL APPLICATIONS (WITH THE EXCEPTION A	L NEEDED) E (onks no S require S remotes	INFORMATIO NY AVPLY 1 An Auditi	NAS S FC FILL Lonal S	TATED IN INC AN A INC ON A	REGULAT BANDONED Loging "Cho	TONS. WELL N FER
D. A SKETCH OF ANY PROPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL RECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE M WITHIN SKELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ R ARE FOLLY UNDERSTOCE AND ACR	DEED MONIT LEE SEREES L.S.C.H.D. REMORE, TH OY THE APP REED UPON	AGREE TO AGREE TO TO REGUL TO REGUL IE OUTIES TECANT AN	N WELL L MUST COMPT. ATE WA WHICH D BY T	APPEICAT SE ENCO Y WOTH A TER QUAL ART LIST HE WELL	LONG). LOSED. LL RULES LTY CONT. ED IN TH DRILLER,	AND ROL E AND
D. A SNETCH OF ANY WROPC THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL RECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE M WITHIN SHELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ A ARE FOLLY UNDERSTOOD AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER	DEED MONIT LER HEREBY LER C.H.D. RMORE, TH RMORE, TH V THY APP REED UPON.	AGREE TO TO REGUL TO REGUL TO REGUL TO REGUL TO REGUL	I WELL L MUST D COMPT. D TE WA WHICH D BY T	APPEICAT SE ENCI Y WITH A TER QUAL ART LIST HE WELL DA	TIONS). DSED. LL RULES. ITY CONT ED IN TH DRILLES, TE	AND ROL B AND
D. A SNETCH OF ANY WROPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL RECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE M WITHIN SHELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ B ARE FOLLY UNDERSTOCE AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL DRILLER	SED MONIT LER HEREBY L.S.C.H.D. RMGRE, TH Y THE APP REED UPON.	AGREE TO AGREE TO TO ABOUL IE OUTIES VEICANT AN	I WELL L MUST O COMPT. ATE MA WHICH ID BY TI	APPEICAT SE ENCI Y WITH A TER QUAL ART LIST HE WELL DA	TIONS). DSED. LL RULES LITY CONT. ED IN TH DRILLER, TE TE	AND ROL E AND
D. A SNETCH OF ANY WROPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL SECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE M WITHIN SKELBY COUNTY. FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ A ARE FORLY UNDERSTOCE AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMERAL REQUIREMENTS BY AN A UF THE APPLICATION IS APPROV. SEMIT WILL BE ISSUED IN RAI SENT TO THE APPLICANT. MO CON MEEN RECEIVED, AND SHALL DE H AS BEEN COMPLETED.	NT RESERV DOCUMENT REED UPON NT RESERV DOCUMENT SU BY THE TING TO T NETRUCTIO KOPT AT T	ES THE RI SEALTH D HE WELL SAGREE TO TO REGUL E OUTIES LICANT AN ES THE RI S MAY BE HE ALL IN N IS TO B HE CONSTRU	GHT TO REQUIRE EDARTM CHILLER BULLER EGIN UN UNTION	APPEICAT SE ENCI Y WITH A TER QUAL ARE LISE HE WELL DA DA DA SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM	TIONS). DSED. UL RULES LITY CONT TED IN TH DRILLES, TE TE TE ENT THE CONSTRUCTION O PERMIT NIL THE F	AND ROL E AND AND ION IG HAS FEEL
D. A SNETCH OF ANY WROPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL SECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE M WITHIN SKELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ A ARE FORLY UNDERSTOCE AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL DRILLER REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMERAL REQUIREMENTS BY AN AN UF THE APPLICATION IS APPROV SERMIT WILL BE ISSUED IN WRITHEN RECEIVED, AND SHALL DE M MEN RECEIVED, AND SHALL DE M MEN RECEIVED, AND SHALL DE M MEN RECEIVED.	DEPARTME	ES THE RI SMAY BE HE WELL IN SEALTH D HE WELL IN N IS TO B HE CONSTRU	WELL L MUST L MUST ATE WA WHICH D BY T D BY T GHT TO REQUINE EPARTME EPARTME EDIN UN UCTION LY	APPEICAT SE ENCI Y WITH A TER QUAL ARE LISE HE WELL DA DA SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM SUPPLEM	TONS). DSED. UL RULES LITY CONT TED IN TH DRILLES, TE TE TE ENT THE CONSTRUCTION O PERMIT NIL THE F	AND ROL E AND AND ION IG HAG JEEL
D. A SNETCH OF ANY VEOPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL RECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE M WITHIN SKELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ B ARE FOLLY UNDERSTOCE AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER NEMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME R	NT RESERV DEPARTMEN	RODUCTION PORING. WEL AGREE TO TO REGUL IE OUTIES "LICANT AN ES THE RI S MAY BE HEALTH D HE WELL IN N IS TO B HE CONSTRU-	H WELL LL MUST ATE MA WHICH D BY TH D BY TH GHT TO REQUINE EQIN UN UNTION LY	APPEICAT SE ENCI Y WITH A TER QUAL ARE LISI HE WELL DA DA DA SUPPLEM KUCH A G WICH A G VIL GAL	TONS). DSED. DSED. DEL RULES. ITY CONT. ED IN TH DRILLES. TE. TE. TE. TE. COPY BUIND D PERMIT NIL THE F	AND ROL E AND AND ION IG HAS ISEL
D. A SNETCH OF ANY WROPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL SECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE N WITHIN SKELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ A ARE FORLY UNDERSTOCE AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL DRILLER REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEP	DEPARTME	ES THE RI SMAY BE HE WELL IN SEALTH D HE WELL IN N IS TO B HE CONSTRU	WELL L MUST L MUST ATE WA WHICH D BY T D BY T GHT TO REQUINE EPARTME EPARTME EGIN UN UCTION LY LC	APPEICAT SE ENCI Y WITH A TER QUAL ARE LISE HE WELL DA DA SUPPLEM	IONS). DSED. UL RULES LITY CONT TED IN TH DRILLES, TE TE TE ENT THE CONSTRUCTIONS D PERMIT NIL THE F	AND ROL E AND AND ION IG HAS JEEL
D. A SNETCH OF ANY VEOPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL RECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE N WITHIN SKELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ B ARE FORLY UNDERSTOCD AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL DRILLER REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALT	DEPARTMEN	RODUCTION PRODUCTION PORING. WEL AGREE TO TO ADOUL E OUTIES "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "S TO B HE CONSTRU- NT USE ON	WELL L MUST ATE MA WHICH D BY T D BY T D BY T CHI TO REQUINE EQUINE EQUINE EQUINE CONTION LY LC	APPEICAT SE ENCI Y WITH A TER QUAL ARE LIST HE WELL DA DA SUPPLEM 40. SUPPLEM 40. SUPPLEM 40. SITE UN 51TE UN 51TE UN	IONS). DSED. LL RULES LTY CONT ED IN TH DRILLES, TE TE TE TE ENT THE COPY BEIN D PERMIT D11 THE F	AND ROL E AND AND ION IG HAS ISEL
D. A SNETCH OF ANY VEOPO THE APPLICANT AND WELL DRILL RECULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE N WITHIN SKELBY COUNTY, FURTHE RECULATIONS HAVE BEEN READ A ARE FORLY UNDERSTOCE AND ACR SIGNATURE OF WELL OWNER SIGNATURE OF WELL DRILLER REMARKS: THE HEALTH DEPARTME REMARKS: THE HEALT	DEPARTMET	RODUCTION PRODUCTION PORING. WEI AGREE TO TO AROUL E OUTIES "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "LICANT AN "S TO B "HE CONSTRU- NT USE ON "NT USE ON "DNDITIONS	WELL L MUST L MUST L MUST ATE WA WHICH D BY T WHICH D BY T C C C C C MAFE MAFE MAFE	APPEICAT SE ENCT Y WITH A TER QUAL ARE LIST HE WELL DA DA SUPPLEM 40. SUPPLEM 40. SUPPLEM 40. SUTE UN 5.TE UN 5.TE UN	IONS). DSED. LL RULES LTY CONT VED IN TH DRILLES, TE TE TE ENT THE CONSTRUCTION O PERMIT NIL THE F	AND ROL E AND AND ION IG HAUS JEEL

11-15-92 (3:059M 203

~

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATING AIR CONTROL APPLICATION

-

()

FORM APC-1	38 162 DATE OF SUDMETTAL
PERMIT APPLICATION	GENERAL INFORMATION
ON EACH FORM: PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT IN	TNIC
ONLY MAIL TO:	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE
Memphis/Shelby County Health Departmer Pollution Control Section Air Engineering Branch B14 Jefferson Avenue, #438E Memphis, TN 38105 Attention: John Yeganeh, Supervisor 1. COMPANY MAKE	AGENCY CODE
MAILLING ADDRESS	
ETTY/STATS	11F C085
2. ADDRESS AT WHICH SDUDDE IS TO BE ORCEATED.	
ADORESS	CITY/STATE
3. TYPE OF ESGANIZATION: CORPORATION () INDIVIDU	
5. PEOPERTY AREA IN ACRES S. NUMBER D	F EMELOYEEE AT THIS ! OFATIOU
7. ANTICIPATED SROWTH IN PRODUCTION:	
P DEDWIT ADDI PRATICAL REALING	
C 3 NEW CONSTRUCTION	7. ESTIMATED COST OF EGGIFMENT - Or Modification :
C 3 NODIFICATION	ALR POLLUTION CONTROL
CTI PERMIT AD OPERATE RECUESTED ("I PEENIT RENEWAL RECUESTED	EBUIFMENT &
() CHANGE OF LOCATION, MAKE AND/OR OWNERSHIP	BASIC EQUIPMENT :
LO. FOR THE NEW CONSTRUCTION, MODIFICATION, TRANSFER ESTIMATED STARTING DATE?E	OF LOCATION OR OWNERSHIP, WHAT IS THE STINATED COMPLETION DATE?
LI. MANS AND TITLE OF INDIVIDUAL TO CONTACT AT THE F	i&m
ATT TOTATORE OF RESPONSIBLE TOTATORY AND A TOTATO A TOTATORY AND A TOTATO AND A T	3. OFFICIAL TITLE:
14. TYPE OR PRINT NAME AND OFFICIAL TIME OF PERSON (3. OFFICIAL TITLE:
14. TYPE OR PRINT NAME AND OFFICIAL TIME OF PERSON : MEMBER OF FIRM:	3. OFFICIAL TITLE:
11. TIONARDAE OF RESPONSIELS 1 NEMBER OF FIRM: 1 14. TYPE OR PRINT NAME AND OFFICIAL TITLE OF PERSON (NAME	3. OFFICIAL TITLE:

£

-

1. Sec. 1.

163 Costinues 38

e

TABLE OF FOLLITION RELOCTION DEVICE OR METROD CLIES

(ALPHAEETICAL LISTING)

NOIE: FOR CYCLENES, SETTLING CHAMPERS, WET SORJEGERS, AND ELECTROSIMIC FRACIL-TIMORS, THE EFFICIENCY RANGES CORRESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING PERCENTINGES:

HIGH: 95 - 9948, MEDIUM: 60 - 958, AND LOW: LESS THAN 808.

IF THE SYSTEM PAS SEVERAL PIECES OF CONNECTED CONTROL EQUIPMENT, INDICATE THE SECTION. FOR EXAMPLE: 008/010; 97%.

IF NOVE OF THE BELOW CODES FIT, USE 999 AS A CODE FOR OTHER AND SPECIFY IN THE COMPANY.

NO EQUIPTENT	
ACTIVATED CARBON LESTREMON	LANSILVE INJECTION - DRY
AFIERE SAFE - DEFET AT ME	LIMESICKE INJECTION - WET
	LIQUED FILTRATION SYSTEM
APRICATE CONVENTION AND A CAR EXPANSE $\sim -(22)$	MET ELPENATOR - HECH VELOUEN* - 014
	MISPELIMINATOR - LOW VELOCITY 015
APTERBURGER - CREATING WITH HEAT EXCHANGER020	FROESS CHANGE 045
ALXALIZED ALLAIMA	PROCESS INTLOSED 054
CATALYTIC CONDUCTON - FILE GAS DESILFURIZATION 039	PROCESS GAS RECOVERY + OFC
CYCLONE - HIGH EFFICIENCY	SETTLENG CHAMBER - HIGH EXPLOTENTY 004
CYCLONE - MEDIUM BEFICIENCY	SETTING (FAMPER - MODILING FEETUTION MODI
CACLORE - LOW EXFICIENCY	
LUST SUPPRESSION BY CHATCAL STABILIZERS OF METERIC	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i$
ATRIS	Since the (Games Collected $(UY) = -(S)$
	SULFURIC ACED MART - CONTACT PRODESS 043
W = W = W = W = W = W = W = W = W = W =	
EXERCISE FREEPINCE PENCY EFFICIENT $ 011$	SLEERIC ACTO PLANT - COURCE CONTROL
ELECTRUSTATIC PRELIPITEICR - ILW INFERTIRE 012	. POINS
SAMUC FILLER - HIGH TENPERATURE 016	SIFUR PLANT
PAERIC FILTER - MEDILM TENPERATURE 017	VAFOR SECONERY SYSTEM (INCLUDING (CHOENEERS
FASRIC FILTER - ION TEMPERATURE	HODING AND OTHER ENDICHIRES) 047
PASRIC FILTER - METAL SCREEN (COFTON GINE) 059	VENIRI STREETS (CASELS COMPT. ON V)- 053
FLARENC	WET STUBER - HICH SETTINGY 001
GAS ADSCRIPTION COLUMN - PACKED,	WEJ, OLDIERED WEUTH ESTIMATOR WOULD IN THE METHOD IS THE WEITHER IN THE METHOD IS THE WEITHER IN THE METHOD IS THE WEITHER IN THE WEITHER INTER INTE
GAS ADSCREPTION CELLINN - TRAY TYPE	$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{$
GAS SERVERER (GENERALL'INTE (LASSIFICATION) 013	NOT STRUCTURE TO METHODALY $ 003$
	WOT SUPPOSED BY WELL'R SEPAYS 061

TABLE OF EMISSION EVERATION WEIROD CODES

NDI'APPLICATE. EMISSIONS ARE KNOWN TO BE ZEED
EMISSIONS BASED ON SOURCE TESTING
EMISSIONS BASED ON METERIAL BALANCE USING ENGINEERING EXPERIESE AND KNULLEDGE OF BACTORS -
EMISSIONS CALLILATED USING EMISSION FACIORS FROM ERA RUBLICATION ND. AP-42 (THEY ATTOM OF MR
POLLUDANT EMISSION FACTORS
EMISSIONS CALCULATED USING A SPECIAL EMISSION FACTOR DIFFERING FROM THAT IN 20-42
OTHER (SPECIFY IN COMENTS)

F۵	JRM APC-2	3	8 16	54 _{pr}	TE OF SUPAIT	Ţ <u>Ă</u> Ĺ
MI	T APPLICATION PROCESS E	MI	SSION	SOU		VER SHEET
0 <i>1</i> 1 E	ACH FORMY PLEASE THRE DR FRONT ON THE ONLY!		Γ	_		
one Fof Affs For Acco	COPY OF THIS FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETE EACH AFOCERS EMISSION BOURCE SLAIMED AND THE OFFIATE BHEET(S), APO-T, AFO-4, ETC., ATTACHE EACH EMISSION POINT, THIS COVER BHEET SHOULD MPANIED BY THE PERMIT APPLICATION, APO-1.	ELY ED BE	EC NOT A AGENCY (COUNTY) SOURCE :	KRITE IN 1005 - 1005, 101,	THES SPACE	
ι. C	CAFANY NAME		NO, EME En Coor	ISION PTE Inate	·	
2. P	ROCESS EMISSION SOURCE NUMPER		NS COORT	INATE I TYPE 1		
3. S	IC CODE 4. INITIAL STARTUP DATE		REVIEWE	? 		
5.6 I N F	IVE A BPSIF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS. OPER NPUTS. MATERIAL OUTPUTS. AND EMISSION POINTS OTE: ATTACH A FLOW DIAGRAM FOR THE PROCESS EM LOW AND ALF FLOW).	ATIO Shou (1551)	N CENTERS. Lo 9e l'Aclu In Source (STORAGE IDED IN T Claimed I	PDINTS. MATE Re descripti Include Mate	IRTAL Ion.: Irtal
-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
-						
-						-
5. T	YPE OF PROCESS: U CONTINUOUS U PATCH U COM	PINE	2			
7. 1	OPERATING SCHEDULE: NORMAL MAXIMUM	D. 1	INDICATE 1	ARNUAL' T	KROUGHPUT	
	A. KOLWS PER DAY		DEC-FEB	MAR-MAY	JUNE-AUS	SEPT-NOV
	8, DAYS PER WEEK					
	C. WEEKS PER YEAR			i		
	FOR OFFICE	USE	<u>Gul y</u>		·	
[] _P	ROCESS EMISSION SOURCE CLAIMED IS <u>ACCEPTABLE</u> .			2		
[] _{PI}	ROCESS EMISSION SOURCE CLAIMED IS <u>NOT ACCEPTA</u>	BLE.				
¥	KY?					
	ECONTENDED MAKE UP OF PROCEES ENISSION SOURCE LLEWAPLE ENISSIONS (FPCM AIR CODE: LES/	ATTI YE	ACHED ON EI Actual en:	IPARATE S	KEET. Lesike.	· · ·
() _P :	RECEBE EMISSION SOURCE IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH	 4991.:	CAPLE REGI	T Hations.		1000 - 1000 1000 - 1000 1000 - 1000
[] _{Pl}	RDCESS EMISSION BOURCE IS <u>NOT IN COMPLIANCE</u> W	1114	APPLICABLE	REGULATI	02 5 .	

.

HD-AFC2+1+98

.

· • •

.

B. LIST MATERIAL INPUTS TO PROCESS SHISSION SOUPCE:

NEW NATERIAL OR FROM OTHER PROCESS EMISSION	LBS/OP Ho	FLOW DIAGRAM	
SOURCE? (GIVE PROCESS #)	NORMAL	HAYTHUS	REFERENCE
			ļ
		:	
		I	
		<u>i</u>	
		-]
,]]	
HOUR INPUT TO PROCESS			
	NEW MATERIAL OR FROM OTHER PROCESS EMISSION SOURCE? (GIVE PROCESS #)	NEW NATERIAL OR FROM LBS/OP OTHER PROCESS ENISSION HO Source? (Give process *) Normal	NEW MATERIAL OF FROM LBS/OPERATINE OTHER PROCESS ENISSION HOUR SOURCE? (GIVE PROCESS *) NORMAL MAXIMUM HAXIMUM

EMISSION SOURCE

9. LIST MATERIAL OUTPUTS FROM THIS PROCESS EMISSION SOURCE

I BIVE . OF PROCESS IF THIS Is an input to another	LB5/OP Ho	FLOW DIAGRAM	
PROCESS EMISSION SOURCE	NORMAL	NAXINUN	REFERENCE
	1		
		4	· · · · · · · · · ·
	<u> </u>		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	l		
· · - · ·			
	{		┨
	I BIVE • OF PROCESS IF THIS IS AN ENPUT TO ANOTHER PROCESS EMISSION SOURCE	EIVE • OF PROCESS IF THIS LB5/OP IS AN INPUT TO ANOTHER PROCESS EMISSION SOURCE NORMAL	IS AN INPUT TO ANOTHER HOUP PROCESS EMISSION SOURCE NORMAL

EMISSION SOURCE

10. LIST AIR POLLUTION EMISSION POINTS FOR THIS PROCESS EMISSION SOURCE. ATTACH A SEPARATE "EMISSION POINT DATA" SHEET, APC-3, APC-4, ETC., FOR EACH EMISSION POINT.

		LBS/OPERATING HOUR					
EMISSION POINT #,	PARTE	CULATE	J SULFUR	DIDIIDE	<u>HYDRO</u>	CAPPON	FLON DIA5RAM
NAME, OR CODE	NORMAL	MAXINUN	NORMAL	HAT CHUM	NORMAL	MAXINUS	REFERENCE
A]]]
8.]					
<u>. </u>			}			}]
D.					,		
E.		1				}	
F							
6.]						
Н.							
Ι.							
TOTAL LOS POLLUTANT	J]]]	I	4

ENITTED/OPER. HOUR

1 MOTE: ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS REQUIRED FOR LIENS 8, 9, AND 10.

, (. . .

DATE OF SUBMITTAL

- -

UN ENCH FORME FLEASE FIFE OR A <u>This Data Sheet Should be acco</u> <u>Application, Apc-L. And the Ci</u> 1. Company Name 2. Process Emission Source Num 3. Emission Point Number or Ci (Ab Shown on Process Emission 4. Stack or Release Point Heig	NPAMIED BY THE PERMIT NER SHEET, APC-2. NBER IDE IN SOURCE COVER SHEET) INT ABOVE GROUND	OO MOT WRI AGENCY COO COUNTY COD SOURCE MO. POINT NUMB EW COORDIN NS COORDIN EMISSION T REVIEWER DATE	TE IN THIS SPACE
5. DIAMETER OF STACK OR RELEAS	E MECHANISM AT TOP _		FT.
5. NORMAL GAS TEMPERATURE	<u>ب</u> د.		-
7. PERCENT OF TIME OVER 125 DE	GREES Y	۲	
A. EXIT GAS VELOCITY	FT./SEC.		
7. BAS VOLUME FLOW RATE	CU. FT./SEC.	9 70 "F AND OWE T. DRY 645 9 70	F.
I. DISTANCE FROM RELEASE POINT	NEAREST PROPERTY LINE		FI.
2. AIR POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIP	MENT		
AIR CONTAKINANT CONTROLLED	YEAR INSTALLED	TYPE 1	EFFICIENCY
PARTICULATE			
SULFUR DIDIIDE			-
HYDROCARBONS		-	
OTHER			
<u> </u>			
I USE THE CODE NUMBERS SHOWN (IF THIS EMISSION POINT HAS SE AS FOR EXAMPLE: 000/010: 80	IN THE BACK OF APC-L FO IN THE BACK OF APC-L FO IVERAL PIECES OF CONTRO 12/982	R INDICATING TYP IL EQUIPMENT, IND	E OF CONTROL EQUIPMENT. PICATE THE SEQUENCE,

IF YES, DESCRIBE

14. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: _

38 167

-

15. AIR CONTAMINANT DATA FOR THIS EXISSION POINT:

	AB	P R	CONCENTRATION		NORKAL Emissidxs	NAY LAUK Erissighs	METHOD OF
POLLUTANT	E XX T	E S I N T	QUAXTITY	TS	(LES/ROUR)	(LBS/ROUA)	MEASUREMENT (1)
PARTICULATES	Ì			grains/sef		<u> </u>	
SULFUR DICXIDE	Ì			608			
NITROBEN DIOXIDE(S)	Ī			ppa		<u> </u>	
HYDROCARBONS	Ī	İ		pps			
CARPCH MOMOXIDE				bby			
DTHERS	Ī	Π		poo			
	I						
	Ì	Π					

(1) ATTACH A COPY OF THE TEST PROCEDURE, PROCESS NATERIAL BALANCE STUDY OR OTHER BASIS USED AS METHOD OF MERSUPEMENT.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

B PROCESS WEIGHT TABLE APPLIES TO THIS EMISSION POINT.

D ERISSION FOINT IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE RESULATION:

ERISSION FOINT IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH PARTICULATE EMISSION STANDAPD.

D ENISSION POINT IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE NITH HYDROCARBON STANDARD.

0 CONTINUOUS HONITOR(S) RECOMMENDED FOR______

• • • • · · · · · · ·

NPDES APPLICATION FOR PERMIT TO DISCHARGE PROCESS WASTEWATER

.

.

.

-

÷

◆EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Permits Division

Office of Water Enforcement and Permits Washington, DC 20460

EPA Form 3510-2D September 1986

Application Form 2D –

New Sources and New Dischargers:

Application for Permit to Discharge Process Wastewater

38 170	}
--------	---

	<u> </u>	L EPA ID (NUMBER (CORV FROM LIER 1 of Form 11	Form Approved
Please type or print	in the unshaded areas o	niv		OMB No. 2040-0085 Applo-al expires 7-31-88
20	0	Ν	lew Sources and N	ew Dischargers
NPDES	VEPA A	pplication	for Permit to Disch	narge Process Wastewater
I. Outfall Locatio				
For each out	fall, list the latitude an	d longitude, and the	e name of the receiving water.	
Uuttali Numbe //isrl	Den' Mint Sec	Longitude	Receiving Water (name)	
	l dec	i jen		
<u> </u>	<u>i I</u>			
		:		
		i		
il. Discharge Da	te (When do you expe	ct to begin discharg.	mg?)	
III Elevie Elevie	Ar Al Dellusian	tenner Torta		
A. For each	outfall, provide a	description of	i) All operations contributing	wastewater to the effluent including
process	wastewater, sanit	ary wastewater	, cooling water, and stormwa	ter runoff; (2) The average flow contrib-
if necess	each operation; a sary.	ind (3) The (rea	itment received by the waste	ewater. Continue on additional sheets
Ouriall				
Number		flist)	include units;	3. Treatment (Description or List Codes from Table 2D-1)
		_		
·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	•			
· <u> </u>	_			
	1			<u></u>
. <u> </u>				
			· .	

-

J

	Attach a line operations con detailed descrip between intake certain mining any collection (drawing st tributing w ptions in Ite s, operatio activities), p or treatmen	nowing the sustewater t em III-A, Cou ns, treatme provide a pic tt measures	water flow o the effluer instruct a wal int units, and clorial descrip s.	through the fa at, and treatmen er balance on th outfalls, if a wat ption of the natur	cility. Indicate t units labeled t te line drawing b er balance cann re and amount o	sources of intak o correspond to t by showing avera tot be determined f any sources of w	e water, the more ige flows l(e.g., for vater and
C.	Except for store seasonal?	m runolf, le	aks, or spil	ls, will any o	f the discharges	described in ite	m III-A be intern	nittent or
		ompiele ine n	mowing table;	1 Ere			2.610.0	
	001 Num	all ber		a. Doys Per Week (specily average)	b. Months Per Year (specify average)	a. Maximum Daily Flow Rate <i>(in mgd)</i>	b. Maximum Total Volume (specify with units)	c. Duratio (in days
	Induction							
191.V	here is an applicab tual production lev 51 3 years of opera	le production el, not design tion. If produ	-based efflue 1), expressed ction is likely	int guideline or in the terms an to vary, you m	NSPS, før each out id units used in the ay also submit afte	fall list the estimat applicable effluent rnative estimates (ed level of productio I guideline or NSPS, attach a separate si	n (projection for each of heet).
AC 1irs								
Ac 1ir	a. Qua Year Per D	outy B. I Say Mi	Units of easure		c, Operatio	an, Product, Material, e	ne (specify)	

		172
EPA ID Number (c	opy from hem 1 of Form	1/ Outfall Number
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
bu to report estimate routfalls. Each part of ith the specific instr al sheets of paper if e 2D-2 for Pollutant. tou to provide an esti- for all pollutants in (I outfalls, data for p nt or are limited direct	d amounts <i>(both con</i> of this item addresse ructions for that par necessary. <i>s)</i> mated daily maximu Group A, for all outfa ollutants in Group 8 ctly by an affluent lir	mentration and mass) of the pollutant es a different set of pollutants and sho it. Data for each outfall should be o mand average for certain pollutants i ills, must be submitted unless waived a should be reported only for polluta mitations guideline or NSPS or indired
2. Maximum Daily Value (include units)	3. Average Daily Value linclude unitst	4. Source (see instructions)
· · · · · · · ·		·
<u></u> !		
- <u> </u>	<u>_</u>	<u>_</u>
<u> </u>		
	_	
- <u>+</u>		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
·		
1 1	· · ·	
	EPA ID Number (c outo report estimate outfalls. Each part of ith the specific instr al sheets of paper if 2 2D-2 for Pollutant. ou to provide an esti- for all pollutants in (c) 1 outfalls, data for p nt or are limited dire- ator pollutant. 2. Maximum Daily Value (include units) 1 outfalls 1 outfalls	B EPA ID Number (capy from item 1 of Form out or report estimated amounts (both con- outfalls. Each part of this item addresse in the specific instructions for that part al sheets of paper if necessary. = 2D-2 for Pollutants) out oprovide an estimated daily maximu for all pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutants in Group A, for all outfalls, data for pollutant A, for all outfa

-

-

CONTINUED FROM THE FRONT	EPA ID Number (copy from item 1 of Form 1)
C. Use the space below to li reason to believe will be obelieve it will be present.	st any of the pollutants listed in Table 20-3 of the instructions which you know or have discharged from any outfall. For every pollutant you list, briefly describe the reasons you
1, Pollutani	2. Reason for Discharge
•	
	·
	•
VI. Engineering Report on Wastewat	er Treatmant
A. If there is any technical evaluat	ion concerning your wastewater treatment, including engineering reports or pilot plant studies, check the
appropriate box below.	
D Report Availabl	e LJ No Report
production facility with re	cation of any existing plants, which, to the best of your knowledge, resembles this spect to production processes, wastewater constituents, or wastewater treatments.
Name	Location

.

-

VII. Other Information (Optional)

Use the space below to expand upon any of the above questions or to bring to the attention of the reviewer any other information you feel should be considered in establishing permit limitations for the proposed facility. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

38

174

VIII. Certification

Ļ

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of line and imprisonment for knowing violations.

B. Phone No
D. Date Signed

- -

CITY OF MEMPHIS, DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS "INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGE PERMIT" APPLICATION

.

.

. 7

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGE PERMIT APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

Please follow closely the provided instructions when completing the Application Form. All entries except for the signature, shall be at least printed or preferably typed.

SECTION A - GENERAL INFORMATION

- A.1 The Corporate Name shall be the name of the official corporation of which the facility is a part. This name shall be that of the "first line" corporation, and not a parent corporation.
- A.2 The Corporate Headquarters Address should be the mailing address of the headquarters of the above-named corporation.
- A.3 The Company Name should be that name which is used for official transactions with the facility.
- A.4 The Mailing Address should be the address to which all correspondence of an official nature regarding the facility would be sent.
- A.5 The Facility Name should be that of the plant or facility for which this application is being submitted. A separate application is required for each facility. Please use the plant name which is in common usage, since this name will be referenced frequently in correspondence.
- A.6 The Facility Address should be the actual street address of the above-named plant.
- A.7 The Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code for your facility should be entered on the application in decreasing order of wastewater volume produced by each activity. The SIC codes may be found in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual published in 1987 as prepared by the Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D. C. A copy of this publication may be found in most public libraries.
- A.8 The Contact Official is the person, such as the plant manager, who has the responsibility for, or the knowledge of the wastewater discharges of the facility. Also provide the title and phone number of this individual.
- A.9 The Signing Official should be an official of the company with the authority to sign for the company and certify the accuracy of information provided on this discharge agreement. Also provide the title and mailing address of this individual.

l

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION A - GENERAL INFORMATION (continued)

A.9 (continued)

à

- For the purpose of this agreement the signature will be:
 - (1) By a responsible corporate officer which means (i) a president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy or decision making functions for the corporation or (ii) the manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operation facilities employing more than 250 persons or having gross annual sales or expenditures exceeding \$25 million (in second-quarter 1980 dollars), if authority to sign documents had been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures.
 - (2) By a general partner or proprietor if the Industrial User is a partnership or sole proprietorship respectively.
 - (3) By a duly authorized representative of the individual designated in (1) or (2) of this section if: (i) The authorization is made in writing by the individual described in paragraph (1) or (2); (ii) The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the facility from which the Industrial Discharge originates, such as the position of plant manager, operation of a well, or well field superintendent, or a position of equivalent responsibility, or having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company; and (iii) The written authorization is submitted to the City of Memphis.
 - (4) If an authorization under (3) of this section is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, or an overall responsibility for environmental matters for a company, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of paragraph (3) of this section must be submitted to the City of Memphis prior to or together with any reports to be signed by an authoried representative.
- A.10 The Signing Official should sign and date the application in the space provided only after having fully reviewed the completed application.

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION B - FACILITY OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

ł

the second se

:

;

.

- B.1 Brief Description of the manufacturing or service activity of premises.
- B.2 List the maximum quantity per day of major raw materials or feedstocks used at your facility. If you have a prepared list of raw materials, this may be submitted with the application in lieu of completing this table (daily maximum quantities must still be reported). Should the space provided prove insufficient additional sheets may be attached. Use standard units in reporting quantities used on a daily basis (e.g., lbs/day, gal/day, etc.).
- B.3 List the catalysts used or required for productions and the intermediates produced at your plant.
- B.4 List the products produced at your plant. Refer to the instructions listed for Item B.2.
- B.5 List the by-products and waste products at your plant.
- B.6 List the substances that you add to your non-contact cooling water. Also list the fate of all non-contact cooling water.
- B.7 Indicate the days of operation per calendar week, e.g., Monday-Friday, Monday-Saturday, etc.
- B.8 Indicate the normal hours of operation and the number of employees assigned to each shift, according to weekday or weekend operation. Be certain to designate times as am. or pm.
- B.9 If deviations from normal weekly operations occur (e.g., no Wednesday afternoon shift) and/or scheduled shutdown, do indicate.
- B.10 Indicate if your processes are subject to any seasonal variation. If so, provide the approximate maximum and minimum wastewater flow rates in gallons per day, of wastewater discharged to the municipal sewer system and the month(s) of the year when these occur.
- B.11 Briefly describe the operational variables and frequency of occurrence that may result in an unusual discharge (e.g. regular batch discharges, weekly clean-ups, etc.).
- B.12 List the person (or position held) on the plant site who may be contacted for emergency situations during plant operating hours.
- B.13 List the person(s) who shall be contacted at any time during an emergency situation.

3

38 - 179

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public.Works

SECTION C - WATER USAGE CHARACTERISTICS

- C.1 Indicate the annual quantity of water used at your facility by source as shown in million gallons. These figures should reflect all sources of water and all uses of water.
- C.2 Give the MLG&W billing address if different from the facility's address.
- C.3 List all the MLG&W numbers used at the plant site.
- C.4 Indicate the daily average water consumption used for the purpose listed. Domestic/Food services refers to all sanitary conveniences and shall include any food services for employees. If seasonal variations change the percentage over a year's time, provide (on an attached sheet) a percentage breakdown for the listed water usage purposes for each season, defining the applicable season (e.g., by months).

SECTION D - WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS

- D.1 Indicate the average daily quantity of wastewater discharged to the municipal sanitary sewer system, in gallons per day as well as the fate of all other water discharged or lost from your plant.
- D.2 List and describe the spill prevention control and counter-measure plan in effect for the facility.
- D.3 Provide data for the listed parameters as determined by the analysis of samples collected by you or your representative from your facility's discharge to the municipal samitary sever system. Data generated by the City of Memphis's sampling of your facility is not to be supplied. Provide the most current, comprehensive data. If no data is available, enter "NA" in the appropriate blank. No survey need be immediately conducted just for the purpose of completing this application. Describe the pertinent factors of the sample/survey reported on, such as the date(s), time(s), type (grab, composite, average of composite analyses, flow-proportional), sampling location(s), etc. (See Appendix C for definitions for "daily average maximum level", "instantaneous maximum level" and "minimum pH limit", as well as the conversion formula for mg/l to #/day.
- D.4 Give the name of person or laboratory responsible for the discharge sampling and analysis.
CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION D - WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS (continued)

1

- D.5 If your facility operates wastewater pretreatment processes, so indicate and complete items a, b and c. Such processes may be as simple as the separation of oils and greases in traps or far more complex.
 - a. The unit processes used for wastewater pretreatment should be described here along with the wastewater quality parameter which is affected by the process. Also indicate the degree of treatment which occurs under normal operating conditions, or the efficiency of the process.
 - b. Any production characteristics and their associated problems which may affect the pretreatment processes should be briefly described here. Examples are changes in water flow due to normal operating schedule changes, and changes in wastewater constituents due to changes in chemical production.
 - c. Describe the methods used to assure the optimum operation of pretreatment processes. An example is automatic pH control by acid or caustic dosing.
- D.6 List and describe batch discharges by type, volume, strength and time of discharge if being discharged.
- D.7 List and describe the type and description of metering and sampling facilities for the sever discharge in the facility.

SECTION E - SEWER FLOW PLAN, SITE PLAN AND PROCESS SCHEMATIC

- E.1 Give the area of the plant site in acres.
 - E.2 Provide a flow plan or a list of sewer outlets, size, flow of your facility.
 - E.3 Provide a site plan of your facility indicating major structures and existing or proposed wastewater monitoring locations, drains, catch basins and other sever access points. Also, indicate areas used for storage and processing of materials considered to be hazardous. If suitable, the space provided may be used for the plan, or a recently prepared site plan may be attached.

38. 181

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION E - SEWER FLOW PLAN, SITE PLAN AND PROCESS SCHEMATIC (continued)

E.4 Provide a diagram of the flow of materials and water/wastewater for your entire operations, showing all major activities and unit processes generating wastewater. Indicate daily water flow rates for normal operation conditions. If suitable, the space provided may be used for the diagram, or a recently prepared diagram may be attached.

EXAMPLE:

i

1



E.5 Provide a diagram and description of all areas with quantified acreage in square foot where storm water (run-off) are discharged into the sanitary sever from the Industrial User facility.

SECTION F - SELF-MONITORING SCHEDULE

Self monitoring and analysis are required 'to demonstrate continuous compliance by categorical industries and/or other non-categorical

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION F - SELF-MONITORING SCHEDULE (continued)

industries with high pollutant limits as determined by the City of Mamphis. The results of sampling and analysis of the Discharge shall include the flow and the nature and concentration, or the production and mass where required by the controlling authority of pollutants contained therein which are limited by the applicable Pretreatment Standards. The terms and conditions will be set forth by the City of Memphis during the completion of this Discharge Agreement.

SECTION G - COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE

:

A compliance schedule is required by Industrial User for meeting categorical pretreatment standards and/or the City of Memphis pretreatment requirements. The schedule shall contain increments of the progress in the form of dates for the commencement and completion of major events leading to the construction and operation of additional pretreatment required for the Industrial User to meet the applicable local and/or categorical Pretreatment Standards. No increment shall exceed 9 months. No later than 14 days following each date in the schedule and the final date for compliance, the Industrial User shall submit a progress report to include at a minimum, whether or not it complied with the increment of progress to be met on such date and, if not, the date on which it expects to comply with this increment of progress, the reason for delay, and the steps being taken by the Industrial User to return the construction to the schedule established. In no event shall be more than 9 months elapse between such progress reports to the City of Memphis.

SECTION H - HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

List all hazardous, toxic, noxious or malodorous materials used or produced at your facility. Where applicable, provide both the generic and trade name of the material. Indicate the average daily usage rate (or production rate, where produced on site) of the material, as well as the typical quantity stored on site. Be certain to provide units of measurement for both of these items. As concisely as possible, provide the location(s) of both material usage and storage. If a pre-prepared listing is submitted, all required information shall still be reported.

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGE PERMIT APPLICATION

:

1

ECT	ION A - GENERAL INFOR	TION	
-1	Corporate Name		
.2	Corporate Headquartes	Address	
		Street/P.O. Bo:	x
	City	State	Zip Code
.3	Сотрату №ате		<u> </u>
.4	Mailing Address		
		Street/P.O. Bo:	I
	City	State	Zip Code
. 5	Facility Name		
. 6	Facility Address		
	·	Street	Zip Code
.7	Standard Industrial (assification(s) a	_ b
	c (e	_ f
. 8	Contact Official		
		Name	
	Title		Telephone
.9	Signing Official		
		Name	
	Title	Street/P.O. Bo:	x
	City	State	Zin Code

A.10 I certify that the information contained in this application consisting of seventeen pages (and any appendices) is familiar to me and to the best of my knowledge and belief, such information is true, complete and correct.

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION B - FACILITY OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

.

:

2

:

.

.

.

.

-

1

.

ž

...

B.1 Brief Description of manufacturing or service activity of premises

3,2	Baw Materials Type	Quantity Used
	<u> </u>	
		<u> </u>
	[] Pre-prepared list attached.	[] Above listing continued of attached sheet(s)
.3	Catalysts, Intermediates Type	Quantity Used
	[] Pre-prepared list attached.	[] Above listing continu

38 185

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

. .

17

.

.

-

÷

.

.

.

•

B.4	Principal Products	(martity
	1ype	Produced
		<u> </u>
	· · · · · ·	
	<u>_</u>	
	[] Pre-prepared list attached.	<pre>[] Above listing continued on attached sheet(s)</pre>
8.5	By-products and Waste Products	
	Туре	Quantity Produced
	[] Pre-prepared list attached.	() Above listing continued ou

· -

÷-.

CITY OF MEMPEIS Division of Public Works

.

•

. .

.

.

 $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$

SECT	ION B - FACILITY OPERATIONAL CHARACTERIST	ICS (continued)
B.6	Components of Non-contact Cooling Water Type	Quantity Added
		·
	[] Pre-prepared list attached.	[] Above listing continued on attached sheet(s)
B.7	Weekly days of operation are	<u></u>
B.8	Indicate the hours of operation of y employees per shift.	our facility and the number of
	Shift <u>Start/Stop Times</u> W	<u>Number of Employees</u> eekday <u>Saturday</u> <u>Sunday</u>
	Day Evening Night	
B.9	Other operations scheduled characteristi	cs/scheduled shutdown:
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
B.10	Is your facility's production operation If so, please complete the foll	subject to seasonal variation? owing:
	Seasonal maximum wastewater dischar gal/day, during the months	ged to the municipal sever system of
	Seasonal minimum wastewater dischar	ged to the municipal sewer system of

. . . .

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

.

.

,

2

-

•

:

:

•

•

B.11	Briefly describe the operational that may result in an unusual disc	variables and frequency of occurrence harge from your facility.			
	[] Additional sheets attached.				
B.12	List the person (or position held) on the plant site who may be contacted for emergency situations during plant operating hours.				
	Name	Position			
	Phone Number	_			
B.13	List the person(s) who shall be co situation.	atacted at any time during an emergency			
	Name	Phone Number			

5

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION C - WATER USAGE CHARACTERISTICS

ł

!

! 3

٦

ì

.

C.1 Estimated <u>annual</u> water usage by source:

Source	Million Gallons
Public water supply	
Private vell	
Surface stream	

C.2 MLG&W Billing Address (if different from A.6)

	Street/P.O.	Bax	City	State	Zip Code
C.3	MLG&W Account Number	(or numbers)			
				·	

C.4 List of Daily Average water consumption in the plant:

Purpose	Gallons per Day
Process (industrial)	·
Non-contact cooling	
Boiler Feed	
Incorporated in product	
Domestic/Sanitary	
Other	

[] Breakdown of seasonal percentages on attached sheet.

-38 189

٦

CITY OF MEMPEIS Division of Public Works

SECTION D - WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS

. .

f

.

•

D.1 List of Daily Average of volume of discharge or water loss to:

Method of Discharge or Loss	Gallons per Day
City Wastewater sever	<u> </u>
Storm sever	
Waste Hauler	
Evaporative loss	
Incorporated in product	
[] Breakdown of seasonal per	rcentages on attached she

D.2 List and describe the spill prevention control and counter-measure plan that is in effect for the facility.

[] Additional sheets attached.

. . .

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

•

SECTION D - WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS (continued)

ł

• •

D.3 The analysis of wastewater discharged to the municipal sanitary sever system is given below: (* See Appendix C)

	*DAILY AVERAGE MAXIMUM LEVEL	*INSTANTANEOUS MAXIMUM LEVEL
PARAMETER	mg/1 #/day	_mg/1f/day
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD ₅)		
Total Suspended Solids		
Total Solids		<u> </u>
Oil and Grease (Hydrocarbons)	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Oil and Grease (Total)	<u> </u>	
Ammonia Nitrogen (NH ₃ -N)	<u> </u>	
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	<u> </u>	
Alkalinity (Pounds of 100% sulfuric ac	id per day.(See App	endix B)
Acidity (Pounds of 100% sodium hydr	oxide per day.(See	Appendix B)
	Range Minimum	Maximum
Temperature (Degree Fahrenheit)	•••••••	<u>_</u>
pH (Standard Doits) (See Append	ix C)	
[] Analysis sheet attached.		
Sample/Survey description:		
		··

OTHER POLLUTANTS: These are Priority Pollutants and other substances that may be present in the wastewater discharge. See Appendix A and C.

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION D - WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS (continued)

•

1

- D.4 Give the name of person or laboratory responsible for the discharge sampling and analysis ______
- D.5 Is your facility's wastewater treated prior to discharge to the municipal sever system? ______ If yes, complete the following:

_ . .

a. Briefly describe the unit processes used and the wastewater quality before and after treatment.

_____. [] Additional sheets attached.

· ____

b. Briefly describe your facility's production characteristic and any persistent or normal operational problems that may affect the operation of the pretreatment system.

9

.

. [] Additional sheets attached.

.

_ _ . .

_ - - - -

....

CITY OF MEMPEIS Division of Public Works

SECTION D - WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS (continued)

The second second

Δ.

:

÷

-

 Briefly describe the quality testing or process control methodology maintained to ensure acceptable pretreatment levels.

- [] Additional sheets attached.
 [] Copy of typical operating data maintained attached.
- D.6 Any batch discharges? _____. If yes, describe type, volume, strength and time of discharge.

D.7 List type and description of metering and sampling facilities for sevage discharge, if any.

رهينه منعا الداد

....

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

....

•

•

.

ļ

٠

ļ

•

.

:

7

.

•

SECT	ION E - SEVER FLOW PLAN, SITE PLAN AND PROCESS SCHEMATICS	
E.1	Give the area of plant site in acres:	
E.2	Sewer plan - Provide a flow plan or a list of sever outlets, size, flow of your facility. [] Sewer plan or map of facility attached.	7
0000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	120
4		0
Ð		Ŭ
Ø		0
0		₽
<i>0</i> л		4
e A		- #
0		17 A
Ø		đ
Ø		Ĵ
e		ŧ
0		0
0 A		q
V A		¢ A
ð		4 A
Ø		0
¢		0
0		Ø
0		ij,
0	<u>-</u>	Û
U A		0 A
о Л		4 1
, ,		Ø
9	,	ē
0		0
Ø		Ø
0		Ø
0 A		0
4 Л		и "
0		0
0		Ø
0		ē
Ø		Ø
<i>0</i> 		Û
00000	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	0 <i>0</i>

.

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION E - SEWER PLAN, SITE PLAN AND PROCESS SCHEMATICS (continued)

.

į

.

•

:

.

E.3 Site Plan - Provide a plan of your facility indicating major structures and the locations of hazardous materials and certain sever appurtenances.
[] Site plan attached.

00000000000000000000000000000000000000	<i></i>
	Ŭ
	U .
И А	0
17 A	Ű
р А	U a
р Л	u it
0	ti Ji
- j	le Jt
- #	ii ii
Ū.	 J
Ø	
Ø	0
Ø	ġ.
0	đ
0	0
0	Ũ
0	Ũ
0	Ŭ
<i>V</i>	4
<i>(</i> /	Ŭ.
9 A	ii A
У А	a B
У А	0 A
0	0 0
j.	ð
- 9	
Ø	0
0	Ũ
<i>i</i> .	Ũ
U	0
Ø	Ø
ġ.	a
0	Ű
0	0
<i>u</i>	Ŭ.
U	#
¥ ЛЛЛИБЦАЛБЛАЛИЛИДСКИ БАКБЛИКИНАНИКАЛАЛАЛАКИНА 2011 0 0 0 0 0	######################################
***************************************	\\$\\$

. . .

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

5

SECTION E - SITE PLAN AND PROCESS SCHEMATICS (continued) E.4 Schematic Flow Diagram - Provide a diagram of the flow of materials process for your facility. [] Schematic flow of material or process diagram attached. 1 ø Ð ø ø ĝ Ð ø ð ð ŷ Ø ĝ Ø đ ō Ð Ø ø Ð Û Ø Û ł Ø ź-0 ü ÿ 7 ø ü ñ ĥ ø Ë Ø ŧ Ø ¢ ø Ĥ ø ŀ

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

•

:

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

2

•

:

.

.....

-

•

2

.....

-1

•

SEC	TION E - SITE PLAN, SITE PLAN AND PROCESS SCHEMATICS (continued)
E. 5	Permitted Storm Area - Provide a diagram and description of areas with quantified acreage in square feet where storm water (run-off) is discharged into the sanitary sewer at your facility. Total acreage:sq. ft. [] Storm area diagram attached.
0000	
Ø	4
₽ A	Ø
ð	Q A
Ø	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
0 1	0
î Î	Û A
Ø	
0 0	0
0	o o
Ø	
å	9 0
0	, g
9 0	ĝ n
0	u J
₿ n	- 0
0	0 0
0	- g
₽ A	
ø	U U
0	
0	
0	Ū.
0 0	0 0
Ø	0
0 11	0
<i>.</i>	
0 0	0
₽ Ø	(i a
0000	<i></i>

.

. . .

CITY OF MEMPEIS Division of Public Works

SECTION F - SELF-MONITORING SCHEDULE

: -

and the second sec

.

1

...

•

.

ì

٠,

The self monitoring requirement will be determined by the Pretreatment Program requirement and the City of Memphis and to be performed and/or reported by the Industrial User.

<u> </u>	000000000000
Ø	Ø
0	0
0	Ø
0	Û.
0	ē
Û	0
0	Ø
0	Ũ
Ø	Ū
0	Ū.
ŷ.	Ø
ρ.	0
Ø	0
¢	0
Û	0
Ø	0
Û	Ø
Û	Ø
Û	П
0	#
Û	Ø
Û	Ü
Û .	#
Ũ .	Ø
Û .	a
0	Ũ
<i>t</i> · ·	0
Û	Ø
Û .	0
Ũ	Ŭ
0	₽
0	Ð
0	Ŭ.
Ũ	Ð
Ũ	Ű
C .	Ø
0	₽
0	₽
	0000000000000

CITY OF MEMPRIS Division of Public Works

.

SECTION G - COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE

÷

- Provide the compliance schedule as required to meet categorical pretrea standards and other requirements required by the City of Me
 - [] pre-prepared compliance schedule attached.

Ø Ø ø Ø ð Ø ø Ø ø ø 2 ð ø ø 0 ı ø COPY OF BEST PAGE AVAILABLE Ø Ø ð 0 ¢ Ŷ q Ø Ø ð ø ð Ø ø ø 0 9 ø ø

-414 y

.

. .

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

SECTION R - HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

. ..

2

÷

.

List all hazardous, toxic, noxious or malodorous materials used, produced or formed as by-product or waste at your facility.

	I	Daily Usage o	2	Location(s)	Location(s)
Generic Name	Trade Name	<u>Production</u>	<u>Inventory</u>	Usage/Production	of Storage

[] Pre-prepared Listing attached.
[] Above Listing continued on attached sheets(s)

••

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works TABLE I

Page 1 of 3

MAXIMUM EFFLUENT STANDARDS FOR DISCHARGE OF WASTE INTO THE MUNICIPAL SEVERAGE SYSTEM.

ł

÷

ŝ

Constituent	Daily Average* Maximum Concentration mg/l	Instantaneous Maximum Concentration mg/1
Biochemical oxygen demand	(1)	(1)
Settleable solids (m1/1)	(1)	$(\tilde{\mathbf{i}})$
Total suspended solids	(1)	(1)
Nitrogen (total Xjeldahl)	(1)	(1)
Arsenic	1.0	2.0
Cadmium	(2)	(2)
Chromium (hexavalent)	1.0	2.0
Chromium (total)	5.0	10.0
Copper	5.0	10.0
Cyanide (oxidizable)	2.0	4.0
Cyanide (total)	4.0	8.0
Lead	(2)	(2)
Mercury	(2)	(2)
Nickel	5.0	10.0
Zinc	5.0	10.0
Ammonia NH ₃ N	125 ppm	250 ppm

* Based on 24-hour flow-proportionate composite sample (1) Consistent with treatment plant capacity (2) Cadmium, mercury, and lead discharges are severely restricted due to limitations placed on the disposal of sevage sludge containing cadmium, mercury, and/or lead. Actual allowable discharge concentrations for these constituents will be determined on a case by case basis.

No person shall discharge wastewater containing any of the materials listed herein into the municipal sewer system or shall have any connection to the municipal sewer system without obtaining written permission from the Approving Authority.

Acrylooitrile Alpha BHC	3,3-Dichlorobenzidene
Aldrin Aluminum Barium Benzene Benzo (a) pyrene Benzotrichloride Beryllium Bis(2-echylhex1)phathalate (DEHP)	<pre>1,1-Dichloroetbane 1,2-Dichloroetbane 1,1-Dichloroetblyene Dichloroetbyl ether(Bis(2-chloroethyl)) 1,2-Cis,dichloroethylene 1,2-Trans,dichloroethylene 1,2-Dichloropropane 1,3-Dichloropropane</pre>

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works TABLE I

Page 2 of 3

. .

. ж.

Bromobenzeue Bromodichloromethane Bromoform Carbon tetrachloride Chlorodane Chlorobenzene Chlorodibromomethane Dieldrin Chloroethane Chloroform 2-Chlorophenol 0-Chlorotoluene P-Chiorotoluene Cumene DDT/DDE/DDD 1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropane Dibutylphathalate 1,4-Dichlorobenzene(p) Hexachlorobutadiene Tin Titanium Isopropylbenzene Toluene Lindane Methyl chloride (Coloromethane) Molybdenum PCB-1260

Phenols Pyrene Octachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxin Octachlorodibenzofuran Total Heptachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxins Total Heptachlorodibeozofurans Total Hexachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxins Total Hexachlorodibenzofurans Total Peptachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxins Total Pentachlorodibenzofurans Total Tetrachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxins Total Tetrachlorodibenzofurans 1.2.3.4.6.7.8-Reptchlorodibenzo-P-Dioxins 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-Heptachlorodibenzofuran 1,2,3,4.7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxin 1,2,3,4,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-Heptachlorodibenzofuran 1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxin 1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran 1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxin 1,2,3,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran

2,2-Dichloropropane 1,1-Dichloropropane 1.3-Dichloropropene M-Dichlorobenzene 0-Dichlorobenzene Para-Dichlorobenzene Diisobutylenes Dimethlnitrosamine 2,4-Dinitrophenol 2,4-Disitroluene Ethyl benzene Heptachlor Hexachlorobenzene

Toxaphene (chloripated camphene) 1,1,2-Trichloroethane

Trichloroethylene 1,2,3-Trichloropropane Vinyl chloride 0.M.P-Xylenes 1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works TABLE I Page 3 of 3

A manage

1,2,3,7,8,9-Rexachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxin 1,2,3,7,8,9-Hexachlorodibenzofuran 2,3,4,6,7,8-Hexachlorodibenzofuran 2,3,4,7,8-Pentachlorodibenzofuran 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-P-Dioxin 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzofuran

1

.

ł

.

:

.

÷

٤

Approving Authority reserves the right to modify this list of materials prohibited from entering the POTW as may become necessary.

۰.

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

.

÷

÷

.

.

•

•

•

÷

.

.

.

. .

.

Page 1 of 2

-

TABLE 2

GUIDANCE CONCENTRATIONS IN MUNICIPAL SEWAGE TREATMENT INFLUENT

D	South Plant Average Influent	North Plant Average Influent
racameter	Concentrations	Concentrations
BOD (Biochemical oxygen demand)	(1)	(1)
SS (Settleable solids)	(1)	(1)
TSS (Total suspended solids)	(1)	(1)
Nitrogen (Total Kjeldabl)	(1)	(1)
рК	6-9	5-0
Temperature	(2)	(2)
Arsenic	-	(2)
Cadmium	0-005 ppm	0.005
Chromium (Hexavalent)	-	0.000 ppm
Chromium (Total)	0.375 000	0 375 22-
Cyanide (Oxidizable)	-	0.575 ppm
Cyanide (Total)	0.605 nom	0.605
Lead	0.25 ppm	0.005 ppm
Mercury	0.0042 ppm	0.0042 ppm
Nickel	0.273 ppm	0 273 opm
Zinc		10 555
Copper	05 ppm	1.0 ppm 0.5 ppm
Silver	0.0294 ppm	0.0294 000
Phenols	4 5 ppm -	6.0294 ppm
Oil & Grease	100 ppm	100 opm
Toluene	0.429 ppm	20 ppm
Phenol	1.273 nom	0.809.555
Methylene Chloride	0.25 ppm	0.35 ppm
Benzene	0.043 ppm	0.25 ppm
1,1,1 Trichloroethane	0.5 ppm	0.25 ppm
Ethyl Benzene	0.04 ppm	
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.075 ppm	0.04 ppm 0.075 ppm
Chloroform	0.224 ppm	0.075 ppm
Tetrachloroethylene	0 139 550	0.308 ppm
Trichloethylene	0.150 ppm	0.159 ppm
1.2 Transdichloroethylene	0.030	0.130 ppm
Napthalene	0.312 ppm	
Bis(2 Ethyl Hexyl Phthalate)	0 105 ppm	0.312 ppm
Butyl Benzl Phthalate	0.333 ppm	0.103 ppm
Di-n-butyl Phthalate	0.0625 ppm	0.333 ppm
Diethyl Phthalate	0.222 ppm	0.0023 ppm
	o.zzz ppm	0.222 ppm

CITY OF MEMPEIS-Division of Public Works

Page 2 of 2

ورياس معرجتنى

TABLE 2 (continued)

MASS LIMITATIONS - No individual shall discharge a mass loading of the compounds detailed in Table 2 more than 15% of the average allowable influent loading on an average maximum level. When comparing these mass limitations and the concentration based on limitation in Table 1, whichever limitation that is more restrictive will apply, unless a variance is obtained as described in paragraph (c) of this section.

(1) Consistent with treatment plant capacity as determined by the Division of Public Works. (2) Temperature always to be less than 104 degree Fahrenheit (40 degrees Centigrade).

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

APPENDIX A

*** METALS AND NONMETALLIC ELEMENTS ***

-

÷

÷

ų,

:

١

1

•

:

.

١.

•

.

PRIORITY		DAILY AVERAGE	INSTANTANEOUS	
POLLUTANT ANALYTE		MAXIMUM LEVEL	MAXIMUM LEVEL	
NUMBER		<u>mg/1</u> #/day		
	ALUMINUM		· ·	
114	ANTIMONY		·	
112	ARSENIC			
	BARION		·	
117	BERYLLIUM		· ·	
	BISMUTH		· - <u></u>	
	BORUN		·	
118	CADATOM		·	
	CALCIUM		· _ _	
	CERIUM			
119	CHROMIUM (IUTAL)			
	CHRUMIUM (HEXVALENT)	<u></u> _	. <u></u> . <u></u>	
	CUBALT		·	
120	CUPPER			
	DYSPRUSIUM			
	ERBIUM		· ·	
	EUROPIUM		. <u> </u>	
	GADOLINIUM		- <u> </u>	
	GALLIUM	<u> </u>	- <u></u>	
	GERMANIUIM		. <u> </u>	
	GOLD		. <u> </u>	
•	HAFNIOM			
	HOLMIUM		·	
	INDIUM			
	IDDINE	·	·	
	IRIDIUM		· <u></u>	
	IRON			
	LASTHANUM			
122	LLAD		- <u> </u>	
	LITHIOM			
	LUILIIUM	<u></u>	- <u></u>	
	MAGNESIUM	·		
100	MANGANESE			
123	MERLUKI	<u> </u>		
	NEORYAIDA		•	
194	NEODIALUM			
124	NIGNEL			
		<u> </u>	·	
		<u> </u>		
	TALLADIUM Dugedugdug		· ······· ········	
	PROSPROKUS			

Page 1 of 12

e con los e constantes e

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

Page 2 of 12

•

12.5

APPENDIX A

*** METALS AND NONMETALLIC ELEMENTS ***

.

-

3

17

•

-

:

.

٩

PRIORITY			DAILY AVERAGE		INSTANTANEOUS		
POLLUTANT ANALYTE			MAXIMU	M LEVEL	MAXIMU	M LEVEL	
NUMBE	<u>IR</u>			_mg/1	Ø/day	_mg/1	Ø/dav
	PLATINUM						
	POTASSIUM						
	PRASEODYM	IUM					
	RHENIUM						
	RHODIUM						
	RUTHENIUM						
	SAMARIUM						
	SCANDIUM						
125	SELENIUM						
	SILICON						
126	SILVËR						
	SODIUM						<u> </u>
	STRONTIUM						
	SULFUR						
	TANTALUM						
	TELLURIUM						
	TERBIUM						
127	TEALLIUM						
	THORIUM						
	THULIUM						
	TIN						<u> </u>
	TITANIUM					<u> </u>	-
	TUNCSTEN			<u></u>			<u> </u>
	URANIUM					•	
	VANADIUM						
	YTTERBIUM						
	YTTRIUM						·
128	ZINC					<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	ZIRCONIUM						
****	*********	********	********	********	******	********	*******
*** <u>c</u>	LASSICAL **	t ±					
121	CYANIDE (1	(JATO)					
	CYANIDE (C	XIDIZABLE)					
	FLUORIDE						·
	NITRATE -	NITROGEN					
	NITRITE -	NITROGEN				<u> </u>	
	RADIOACTIV	/E MATERIAL					

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

Page 3 of 12

APPENDIX A

*** DIOXINS/FURANS ***

.

.

1

.

PRIORITY POLLUTANT	ANALYTE	DAILY AVERAGE MAXIMUM LEVEL	INSTANTANEOUS MAXIMUM LEVEL
MUTIBLE		<u>mg/1</u> <u>#/day</u>	_mg/1 0/day
001	ACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN		
001	ACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		·
TÓT	AL HEPTACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN	<u> </u>	
TOT	AL HEPTACHLORODIBENZOFURANS		
TOT	AL HEXACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXINS		<u> </u>
TOT	AL HEXACHLORODIBENZOFURANS		
TOT	AL PENTACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXINS		
TOT	AL PENTACHLORODIBENZOFURANS		
TOT	AL TETRACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXINS	——————————————————————————————————————	<u> </u>
TOT	AL TETRACHLORODIBENZOFURANS	······································	<u> </u>
1,2	,3,4,6,7,8-		
	HEPTACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN		
1,2	,3,4,6,7,8-		
	HEPTACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		
1,2	,3,4,7,8-		
	HEXACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN		
1,2	,3,4,7,8-		<u> </u>
	HEXACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		
1,2	,3,4,7,8,9-		
	HEPTACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		
1,2	,3,5,7,8-		<u> </u>
_	HEXACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN		
1,2	3,6,7,8-HEXACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		
1,2	,3,7,8-		
	PENTACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN		
1,2,	3,7,8-PENTACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		— <u> </u>
1,2,	,3,7,8,9-		<u> </u>
	HEXACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN		
1,2,	3,7,8,9-KEXACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		
2,3,	4,6,7,8-HEXACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		
2,3,	4,7,8-PENTACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		<u> </u>
129 2,3,	7,8-TETRACHLORODIBENZO-		
	P-DIOXIN (TCCD)		
2,3,	7,8-TETRACHLORODIBENZOFURAN		<u> </u>

3.8 2	Ĵ	8
-------	---	---

CITY OF MEMPEI5 Division of Public Works Page 4 of 12

5

×

APPENDIX A

*** FIBROUS ***

.

S. 1. - -

-

i

÷

. .

.

-

.

۰.

...

.

PRIORITY POLLUTANT	ANALYTE	DAILY AVERAGE Maximum level	INSTANTANEOUS MAXIMUM LEVEL	
116 ASBES	TOS	_mg/L0/day	_mg/l //day	
			···	

*** VOLATILE ORGANICS ***

FRIOR	ITY	DAILY AVERAGE	INSTANTANEOUS
POLLUTANT ANALYTE		MAXIMUM LEVEL	MAXIMUM LEVEL
NUMBE	<u>13</u>	mg/1 //day	0/10/day
3	ACRYLONITRILE		
4	BENZENE	·	
	BROMODICHLOROMETHANE		<u> </u>
46	BROMOMETHANE (METHYL BROMIDE)		
	CARBON DISULFIDE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
50	CHLOROACETONITRILE		
7	CHLOROBENZENE		
51	CHLORODI BROMOMETHANE		
16	CHLOROETHANE		
23	CHLOROFORM (TRICHLOROMETHANE)		
45	CHLOROMETHANE (METHYL CHLORIDE)		
	CIS-1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE		
	CROTONALDEHYDE	<u> </u>	
48	DICHLOROBROMOMETHANE		
	DIBROMOMETHANE		
	DIETHYL ETHER		
	ETHYL CYANIDE	·	
	ETHYL METHACRYLATE		· · · · · · · · · · · ·
38	ETHYLBENZENE		
	IODOMETHANE		
	ISOBUTYL ALCOHOL		·
	M-XYLENE		
	METHYL METHACRYLATE		
44	METHYLENE CHLORIDE		
	(DICHLOROMETHANE)		
	O+P XYLENE		
85	TETRACHLOROETHENE	·	

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

.

Page 5 of 12

APPENDIX A

*** VOLATILE ORGANICS ***

.

:

2

Continued

PRIOR	ITY	DATLY	AVERAGE	TNSTAN	TANFOUS
POLLU	LLUTANT ANALYTE MAXIMUM I FUTI		IN LEVEL	MAYTMIN LEVEL	
NUMBE	R	mg/1	Ø/dav	mg/1	A/day
			<u> </u>		U
6	TETRACHLOROMETHANE				
	(CARBON TETRACHLORIDE)				
86	TOLUENE				<u> </u>
	TRANS-1.2-DICHLOROETHENE				
	TRANS-1, 3-DICHLOROPROPENE			<u> </u>	<u></u>
	TRANS-1.4-DICHLORO-2-BUTENE				
47	IRIBROMOMETHANE (BROMOFORM)				<u> </u>
87	TRICHLORGETHENE (TRICHTOROFTHYLENE)				<u> </u>
49	TRICHLORCFLUOROMETHANE		- <u> </u>		
	VINYL ACETATE				
88	VINYL CHIORIDE (CHIOROFTHYTENE)				<u> </u>
13	1.1-DICH OROFTHANE			<u> </u>	
	1.1-DICHLOROETHENE				
29	1.1-DICHLOROFTHYIENE				
30	1.2-TRANS-DICHLOROFTHYLENE	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u></u>
11	1.1.1~TRICHIOROFTHANE	<u> </u>			
••	1.1.1.2-TETRACHLOROFTHANE			<u> </u>	<u> </u>
14	1 1 7-TRICHI OPOSTWANY	<u></u>		······	
15	1 1 2 2-TETRACHLOROFTHANE	<u> </u>			
	1.2-DIBRONDETWANE	<u> </u>			
10	1.2-DICHIOROFTHANE				·
•••	1.2-DICHLOROPROPANE	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
	1.2.3-TRICHLOROPROPANE				
	1.3-BUTADIENE, 2-CHIORO		<u> </u>		
32	1.3-DICHLOROPROPANE	<u> </u>			
33	1.3-DICHLOROPROPYLENE		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	1.4-DIOXANE				<u> </u>
	2-BUTANONE		<u>_</u>		<u> </u>
19	2-CHLOROETHYVINYL ETHER (MIXED)		······		
	2-HEXANONE	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
	2-PROPANONE	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
	2-PROPEN-1-OL				
2	2-PROPENAL (ACROLEIN)				
-	2-PROPENENITRILE, 2-METHYL	<u> </u>			
	3-CHLOROPROPENE		<u> </u>		
	4-METHYL-2-PENTANONE				

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

Page 6 of 12

.

APPENDIX A

*** SEMIVOLATILE ORGANICS ***

.

;

| | (

Ì

1

÷

ξ.,

ż

PRIC POLL NUME	DRITY LUTANT ANALYTE <u>HER</u>	DAILY AVERAGE MAXIMUM LEVEL	INSTANTANEOUS MAXIMUM LEVEL
		UI	<u> </u>
1	ACENAPHTHENE		
77	ACENAPHTHYLENE	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	ACETOPHENONE	<u> </u>	
	ALPHA-TERPINEOL		
	ANILINE	<u> </u>	
	ANILINE, 2,4,5-TRIMETHYL	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
78	ANTHRACENE	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	ARAMITE		
	BENZANTHRONE		
	BENZENETHIOL		
5	BENZIDINE	— <u> </u>	
72	BENZO(A)ANTHRACENE		
	(1,2 BENZANTHRACENE)		
73	BENZO(A)PYRENE (3.4-BENZOPYRENE)		
74	BENZO(B)FLUORANTHENE	<u> </u>	————— — <u>—</u> ————
	(3.4-BENZOFLUORANTHENE)		- <u></u>
79	BENZO(GHI)PERYLENE	<u> </u>	
	(1,12-BENZOPERYTENE)		
75	BENZO(K)FLUORANTHANF		
	(11.12-BENZOFI HORANTHENE)		_
	BENZOIG ACID		
	BENZONITRIIE 3 5-DIBRONO-4 UNDRODO		
	BENZYL ALCOHOL	r	
	BETA-NAPHTHYT SMINE		
	BIPHENYT		
	BIPHENYI 4-NITRO	<u> </u>	
17	BISICHIOROMETUVI) ETUER		
43	BIS(2-CHIOROFTHORY)HERMAN		
T.A.	BIS(2-CHLOROETHOAT) CTUER		
42	BIS(2-CHLOROLSOPPOPER) FINER	<u> </u>	
66	BIS(2-FTWT UPVVT) BUTTLE		
67	BUTVI BENZVI BUTULLARD		
	CAPBAZOLE PHINALATE		<u></u> _
76	CHRVSTNE		
	CROTOYVBUOC		
68			
60	DI-A-BUIIL PHIMALATE		
63	DI-N-DUCITL PATHALATE		
69	(M. NITROGODI N		
	DIPENZO(A WAANDA PROPYLAMINE)		
	DIDENZU(A, H)ANTHRACENE		<u> </u>
	DIBENZUFURAN .		······································
70	DIBENZOTHIOPHENE		
10	DIETHYL PHTHALATE		

...

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

٠

į

APPENDIX A

*** SEMIVOLATILE ORGANICS *** Continued PRIORITY DAILY AVERAGE INSTANTANEOUS POLLUTANT ANALYTE MAXIMUM LEVEL MAXIMUM LEVEL NUMBER <u>mg/1</u> 0/day mg/1 0/day 71 DIMETHYL PHTHALATE DIMETHYL SULFONE DIPHENYL ETHER DIPHENYLAMINE DIPHENYLDISULFIDE ETHANE, PENTACHLORO ETHYL METHANESULFONATE ETHYLENETHIOUREA **39 FLUORANTHENE** 80 FLUORENE 9 HEXACHLOROBENZENE 52 HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE 53 HEXACHLOROCYCLOPENTADIENE 12 HEXACHLOROETHANE **HEXACHLOROPROPENE** SEXANOIC ACID 83 INDENO(1,2,3-CD)PYRENE 54 ISOPHORONE ISOSAFROLE _ LONGIFOLENE MALACHITE GREEN MESTRANOL METHAPYRILENE METHYL METHANESULFONATE N-DECANE N-DOCOSANE N-DODECANE N-EICOSANE N-HEXACOSANE N-HEXADECANE N-NITROSODI-N-BUTYLAMINE N-NITROSODIETHYLAMINE 61 N-NITROSODIMETHYLAMINE N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE N-NITROSOMETHYLETHYLAMINE 62 N-NITROSOMETHYLPHENYLAMINE ____ N-NITROSOMORPHOLINE N-NITROSOPIPERDINE N-OCTACOSANE _ ... _ __ N-OCTADECANE N-TETRACOSANE N-TETRADECANE N-IRLACONTANE

Page 7 of 12

1.12

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

,

. .

·

. .

ł

-

2

.

•

- (

i

.

Page 8 of 12

APPENDIX A

***	SEMIVOLATILE ORGANICS ***		Continued
PRIC POLI NUM	DRITY - LUTANT ANALYTE BER	DAILY AVERAGE MAXIMUM LEVEL _mg/10/day	INSTANTANEOUS MAXIMUM LEVEL mg/1\$/day
	N,N-DIMETHYLFORMAMIDE		<u> </u>
53	5 NAPHTHALENE		
50	6 NITROBENZENE		
	0-ANISIDINE	<u> </u>	
	O-CRESOL		
	O-TOLUIDINE		
	O-TOLUIDINE, S-CHLORO		<u> </u>
2:	2 PARACHLOROMETACRESOL		
	P-CHLOROANILINE		
	P-CRESOL	·	
	P-CYMENE	· . <u></u>	
	P-DIMETHYLAMINOAZOBENZENE	<u>-</u>	
	P-NITROANILINE		
	PENTACHLOROBENZENE		
64	PENTACHLOROPHENOL	<u></u>	
	PENTAMETHYLBENZENE	<u></u>	
	PERYLENE		_
	PHENACETIN		
81	I PRENANTHRENE		
03) PAENOL		
	PRENOTATAZINE		
	PRUNAMIDE	<u></u>	
÷.	· FIKENE		
	PIRIDINE		
	RESORCTION F		
	SAFRULL FOULT ENT		
	STADENE		
	JIIREAL Tuiana dutuvne		
	THIOACETANIDE		<u> </u>
	THIORGETATIDE		·····
	TOLUENE 2 4-DIAMINO		
	TRIDHEVYTENY	<u> </u>	
	TRIPROPYLENECTYCOL METHYL ETHER	<u> </u>	
	J-BROMO-2-CHI OROBENZENE		·
	1-BROMO-3-CHLOROBENZENE	····	<u> </u>
	I-CHIORO-3-NITROBENZENE		
	1-METHYLFLUORENE		
	1-METHYLPHENANTHRENE		
	I-NAPHTHYLAMINE		
	1-PHENYLNAPHTHALENE		<u> </u>
	1.2-DIBROMO-3-CHLOROPROPANE		
25	1.2-DICHLOROBENZENE		
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	<u></u>	

.

-

CITY OF MEMPHIS Division of Public Works

.

.

;

:

:

.

1

.

• •

-

APPENDIX A

.

*** :	SEMIVOLATILE ORGANICS ***		Continued
PRIO POLLI NUME:	RITY UTANT ANALYTE <u>Er</u>	DAILY AVERAGE MAXIMUM LEVEL <u>mg/1</u> ddby	INSTANTANEOUS MAXIMUM LEVEL mg/10/day
37	1,2-DIPHENYLHYDRAZINE		
	1,2,3-TRICHLOROBENZENÉ		
	1,2,3-TRIMETHOXYBENZENE	<u> </u>	
8	1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE		
	1,2,4,5-TETRACHLOROBENZENE		
82	1,2,5,6-DIBENZANTHRACENE		
	1,2,3,4-DIEPOXYBUTANE		
	l,3-DICHLORO-2-PROPANOL		<u> </u>
26	1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE		
	1,3,5-TRITHIANE		
27	1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE		
	1,4-DINITROBENZÈNE		
	1,4-NAPHTHOQUINONE		
	1,5-NAPHTHALENEDIAMINE		
.	2-(METHYLTHIO)BENZOTHLAZOLE		
201	2-CHLORONA PHTHALENE		
24	2-CHLOROPHENOL		
	2-IOSPROPYLNAPHTHALENE		
	2-METHYLBENZOTHIOAZOLE		
	2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE		
	2-NITROANILINE	<u> </u>	
57	2-NITROPHENOL		
	2-PHENYLNAPHTHALENE		
	Z-PICOLINE		
	2, 3-BENZUFLUORENE		
	2, 3-DICHLOROANILINE	<u> </u>	·
	2,3-DICELORONITROBENZENE	<u> </u>	
	2, 3, 4, 6-TETRACHLOROPHENOL	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	2, 3, 6-TRICKLOROPHENOL	<u></u>	- <u> </u>
74	2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
50	2,4-DIMETRILPHENOL		<u> </u>
35	2,4-DINIIROPRENUL 2 A_BINITROTOLUENE		<u> </u>
	2 4 5 - TPICHIOLOLOLOLOL		
	2 4 6 - TRICHLOROPAENOL		<u> </u>
	2 6-DI-TERT-BUTYI-D-BENZOOUTNOWE	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	2.6-DICHLORD-4-NITEDANTI INF		<u> </u>
	2.6-DICHLOROPHENDI		
36	2.6-DINITROTOLUENE		
20	3-METYLCHOLANTHRENE		·
	3-NITROANILINE		
28	3.3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE		
	-,	- <u></u>	

Page 9 of 12

RULES OF "TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT DIVISION OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL" CHAPTER 1200-3-9 CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATING PERMITS

(

.

DEC 14 '92 11:15 MPHS. SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPT.

NULES

TENNESSEE DEPARIMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT 07 BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT DIVISION OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

	CHARTER 1200-3-3 CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATING PERMITS	Califati - Folg - Herber - Herber
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
1200-3-901 1200-3-901 1200-3-903 1200-3-903	Construction Permits Operating Permits Cenesal Provisient Exemptions	. 112.2
1200-3-303	Appeal of Permit Application Denisic and Permit Conditions CONSTRUCTION PERMITS	

 $\{\lambda\}$ tion for Construction Permit

6.3.

ŀ

(a) No person shall begin the construction of a new sid Contaminant who source or the modification of an all Contaminant Source which may a result in the discharge of all contaminants without first having applied for and received from the Technical Secretary a construction permit for the construction or medification of such air fontaminant

(b) The application for a construction permit shall be made on forms evailable from the Technical Secretary not less than ninety (90) days prior to the estimated protting date of construction. Sources identified in paragraph 1200-3-9-.01(4) shall make application for a construction permit not less one hundred twenty (120) days prior to the estimated date of construction.

(C) When a source will have a significant (mpace on air quality as defined in subjectograph 1200-1-9-.01(2)(a) the Technical Sectedary shall not issue a permit until there has been an opportunity for public comment concerning the allocation of remaining air resources. Comments shall be made in writing and delivered to the Seconical Secretary within fifteen (15) days afeer the publication of the public notice. Competing interests in Air quality usage may request Board consideration in allocating the remaining dir resources. The applicant for a construction permit shall notify the public, by advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation in much air quality control region in which the proposed source or modification

> 12-14-91 | 11:26AM 207
-

P.3/5

DEC 14 192 11:15 MPHS. SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPT.

- (c) Perticulate matter air contaminant sources that locate in or have a significant impact on air quality in the Kingemort additional control area as defined in Chapter 1200-3-9.
 - Any air contaminant source which emits, or has the potential to emit 5 tons per year or more of particulate matter shall unbilled best available control technology as specified by the Technical Secretary at the time of the completed permit application.
 - "Significant impact on air quality" is defined as specified in Subparagraph (a) of sule 1900-3-9-.01(2).
 - "Ponential to emit" is defined as specified in part 5 of Rule 1200-3-9-.01(4)(b).
- (5) Construction permits issued under this suit are based on the control of air contaminants only and do not in any way affect the applicant's oblightion to obtain necessary permits from other governmental againstes.
- (7) the applicant for a construction permit (or its equivalent by Soard order; shall pay the cost of publication of any motices required by state or rederal law or requirings to effectuate the rights applied for.

Authority: T.C.A. Section 58-25-105 and 4-5-202. Administrative History. Original Rule certified June 4, 1974. Amended effective February 9, 1977. Amended April 12, 1978. Attended June 16, 1978. Amended March 21, 1979. Amended June 11, 1979. Amended Hovember 13, 1978. Emergency rule effective June 3, 1981 through October 1, 1981. Revised effective July 31. 1981. Amended effective October 3, 1981. Amended effective January 22, 1982. Amended effective March 2, 1983. Amended effective January 22, 1982. Amended effective November 6, 1988. Amended effective Juny 17, 1980. Amended effective July 1, 1980.

1200-3-9-.02 OPERATING FERNITS

(1) Any person planning to otherite an air contaminant source constructed or modified in accordance with a construction permit issued by the Technical Secretary in Bule 1200-3-9-01 of this chapter shall apply for and receive an operating permit from the Technical Secretary after initial startup of the said air contaminant source: Ninety (90) days shall be allowed for this, provided paragraph (3) of this rule is complied with. This class period is extended from almost (90) to be headed twenty (120) days if stack sampling has been required as a condition on the construction permit, which is further extended to sixty (60) days after the stack sampling report is required on the construction if a Certain time is specified, provided the stack sempling report is fulled with the Olivision within sixty (60) days or initial startup of the time specified complied with.

14

DEC 14 '92 11:15 MPHS. SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPT.

ł

- (2) No person shall operate an air contaminant source in Tennessee without first obtaining an operating parmit from the Technical Secretary except as specifically exempted in Rule 1200-3-9-.04. New sources operating with a valia construction permit may operate with the construction permit for the time period specifien in paragraph (1) above.
- (3) Application for an operating permit shall be made on forms available from the Technical Secretary and signed by the applicant. Such application for an operating permit shall be filed with the Technical Secretary:
 - (a) Not less than minty (60) days prior to the expiration of an existing operating permit.
 - (5) 1. Not more than thirty (30) days after initial startup of on air contationant source constructed or modified in accordance with a construction permit issued by the Technical Secretary.
 - If stack sampling data has been required as a condition on the construction permit, this time period is extended to the time specified on the construction permit for submittal of the stack compling report(c). In no case shall this period exceed 180 Gays after startup.
- (4) The operating permit shall only be issued on evidence tablefactory to the. Technical Secretary that the operation of said air contaminant source is in compliance with any standards or ruled and regulations promulgated by the Board and that the operation of said air contaminant source will not interfere with the attainment or maintenance of any sir quality standard. Such evidence may include a requirement that the applicant conduct such tests as and necessary in the opinion of the Technical Secretary to determine the kind and/or amount of air contaminants emitted from the starce. Standard operating permits shall be valid for a period of one (1) year or for such time to deemed appropriate by the Technical Secretary. A permit issued for laws rown one year shall be designated as a temporary permit.
- (5) Any person in possession of an operating permit shall maintain said operating permit readily available for inspection by the Technical Secretary or his designated representative on the operating premiser. A person required by these requireions to have one or nece operating permits shall keep at least one operating permit promiseorily and conspicuously displayed on the operating premises.
- (6) Operation of each air contaminant source shall be in accordance with the provisions and stipulations set forth in the operating permit, all provisions of these regulations, and all provisions of the Tennessee Alt Quality Act.
- [7] The owner or operator of any sir contaminant source to which any of the following changes are made, but would not be a modification requiring a

P.4/5

.

construction permit, must notify the Technical Secretary thirty (30) days before the change is commenced. These changes are:

- (a) mange in air pollution control equipment,
- (b) change in stack height or diameter,
- (c) change in thit velocity (of more than twenty five (25%) percent) or exit temperature of more than fifteen (15%) percent (absolute temperature basis).
- (8) Any stack sampling report required on a construction permit is part of " the operating permit application. Any stack sampling report required on an Operating permit is part of the application for renewal of that operating permit.
- (2) The owner or operator of any sir contaminent source subject to an order or variance issued so as to slow the source by its terms to operate while exceeding an omission standard, shall pay the nost of publication of any notices (including, but not limited to, a copy of the order) required by state or federal law or regulations to ettectuate the right of continued operation.

Authority: T.C.A. Section 60-25-105 and 4-5-202. Administrative History. Original Rule Certified June 7, 1974. Amended effective fabruary 9, 1977. Amended effective March 21, 1979. Amended effective June 7, 1950.

1200-1-9-.03 GENERAL PROVISIONS

- (1) Irrespective of the provisions of the proceeding paragraphs of this Chapter, the owner or operator of any air contaminant source that be responsible for complying with emission regulations as contained in other Chapters of these regulations at the earliest practicable time and for this purpose the fourd that have the summerity and responsibility to require compliance with these regulations at an earlier date than incleated where such earlier compliance may reasonably be accomplished.
- (2) NO gerson shall use any plan, annivity, device, or contrivance which the Technical Secretary determines will, without resulting in an actual reduction of air contaminants, control or appear to minimize the affects

56

12-14-92 11:26AM

POS

.

~~

- - - - -

SECTION 13

1

"RULES AND REGULATIONS - MEMPHIS COUNTY GROUNDWATER QUALITY

CONTROL BOARD OF SHELBY COUNTY"

be made or permitted unless the source and use of the euxilliary supply, and the location and arrangement of the intake are approved by the Department in writing.

Section 10 - INSECTION WELLS

No injection wells of woy type shall be allowed in: Memphis and Shelby County for the injection of surface or groundwaters, or chemically or thermally altered water, or any other fluids into the underground formations. No well constructed shall be used for recharge, injection, or disposal purposes.

Section 14 -- VARIANCES

14.01 -- Existing Vells

:

į

ì

Wells in existence on the effective date of this act shall be required to conform to the provisions of these Rules and Regulations, or any rules or regulations adopted pursuant thereto, where such
provisions relate to assessment of fees, cross connection control, improperly maintained wells, abandoned wells and wells constructed in such a way that create serious health hazards, and any other litems deamed necessary by the Department.

14.02 -- APPRALS -- PROCEDURE

Any person who feels aggrieved by an order of the Department issued pursuant to these rules and regulations shall be entitled to a hearing before the Board upon request.

λ. The Board shall have and exercise the power, duty, and responsibility to hear and decide all matters concerning a variance to or an exception taken to any decision, ruling, requirement, rule, regulation or order of the Board or the Department. Such appeal shall be made within fifteen (15) days after receiving notice of such decision, ruling, requirement, rule regulation, or order by filing a written notice of appeal directly to the Board specifying the grounds thereof and the relief requested. Such an appeal shall act as a stay of the decision, ruling. requirement. rule, regulation, or order in question until the Board has taken final action on the appeal. Except when the Department has determined that a health

11-28-92 12:0555 535

P.6/8

Children Constants

SECTION 6

E.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS - MEMPHIS COUNTY GROUNDWATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD OF SHELBY COUNTY"

ŝ

1

-

-

3

;

:

be exercised to make certain that all areas of a well come in full contact with a solution containing enough available chloring to completely destroy all pethogenic microorganizms. An initial chlorine concentration of fifty parts per million (50 ppc) with a residual chlorine requirement of twenty-five parts per million (25 ppm) after twenty-four (24) hours is considered adequate for this purpose. Domestic loundry bleaches containing sodium hypochlorite either in pouder or tablet form may be used. The well shall be allowed to remain undisturbed after the treatment for a period of twenty-four (24) hours and then tested for residual chlorine, at least twenty-five parts per million (25 ppm) musz remain. After successful treatment, all water remaining in the well and supply system shall be pumped free of residual chlorine and a sample of fresh water from the well shall be collected by and tested by the Department for bacteriological purity.

5.08 -- Sempling Of A Vall

- A. After a well has been drilled, modified, or repaired, a negative bacteriological sample shall be obtained prior to placing the well into service.
- B. A well shall not be connected into a premise until a sample has been collected which produces negative bacteriological results.
- C. If a sample collected from a newly constructed well is positive for 8, collform bacteria, it shall be the well driller's responsibility to take whatever steps necessary to properly disinfect the well. Two consecutive bacteriological samples producing negative results must be obtained prior to placing the well into service.
- D. Whenever a well is repaired or modified, it shall be the responsibility of the well driller to notify the Department upon completion of work to sample the well for bacteriological purity. It shall be the well driller's responsibility to properly disinfect the well upon completion.

Section 5 MONITOR AND RECOVERY WELLS CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS

- 6.01 <u>Ceneral</u>
 - A. A construction permit is required for monitor and recovery vells.
 - B. All wells shall be constructed in a manner that will guard against contamination of the groundwater equiftrs underlying Shalby County. No person shall construct,

h.

:

i

:

ł

ţ

•

repair, modify, or abandon or cause to be constructed, repaired, modified, or abandoned any well contrary to the provisions of these Rules and Regulations.

6.02 <u>Siting Criteria</u>

When a well site is subject to flooding it shall be cased to a guint at least two four above the 100-year recurrence flood level for the area. In the case of a flush mount, the well shall have a waterproof seal with a lockable leakproof inner cap. If necessary, the area shall be filled with material approved by the bepartment, properly graded, and maintained to prevent the accumulation or recention of surface water.

6.03 <u>Sanitary Projection of Wells</u>

- A. All water used in the construction of a well shall be from an approved potable water supply. Water obtained from lakes, ponds, streams, and other such surface water cources is not approved and shall not be used in the well construction process.
- B. It shall be the responsibility of the well draller to protect the opening made during the drilling and to prevent any type of contamination from entering.
- C. Should a well be abandoned for any reason, the well shall be filled in a manner prescribed by Section 9 of these rules and regulations.
- D. Whenever construction steps before the well is grouted the open annular space shall be covered and the cusing capped. The casing cap shall be either threaded onto the casing: secured by a friction type device which locks onto the casing: welded; or secured by such other device or method as may be approved by the Department. It shall be the responsibility of the Owner to maintain the Integrity of the protective device placed on the well opening by the well driller.
- E. A well shall be drilled to a size that will permit the outer casing to be surrounded by a water tight seal a minimum of two inches thick. All wells shall be grouted as soon as possible but not later than 24 hours after the well casing has been set in place and all drilling has been completed.
- F. The grout material shall consist of a mixture of near Portland Cement or quick setting cement and water in a ratio of six (6) gailons of water per filnety-four (94) pound sack of cement. A maximum of six (6) percent, by

P.3/8

Ç.

ł

i

;

P.4/8

weight, bencomize may be added. A special condition for grouting a well may be made by the Department within the well construction permit.

G. The method of grouting the annular space of a well shall be throughout the entire length of the casing in one continuous operation from the top of the screen or benconit: seal to the ground surface. The grout mixture may be pumped from the surface when:

- (6) water will not be encountered, and
- (b) the depth is less than twenty (20) feet.

Pressure grouting is required if the aforementioned conditions are not met. Pressure grouting will be accomplianed using a brownie pipe. When the treamic pipe is encased in the grout it must have the same protection as the casing. (refer to paragraph 5.03D)

E. The borchole shall not hydraulically connect separate equifers.

6.04 Construction Materials And Other Requirements

- λ. All interials, components, perts, etc., used in the installation of a monitoring or recovery well, such as the casing, screen, pumping equipment, pressure tank, wiring, pipe, and other such components, must comply with the standards as established in the RULES OF THE TENNELSEE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, DIVISION OF GROUNDWATER PROTECTION, CHAPTER 3400-4-2, entitled, RULES AND REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO GROUNDWATER forecomment AND THE LICENSING OF WATER WELL CONTRACTORS AND FUND SETTERS. When deemed necessary, the Department may require standards and specifications to be more stringent than those required by the State of Tennessee.
- B. The well shall be backfilled to a point, a minimum of two (2) feet above the top of the screen with filter sand, tollowed by a minimum of two (2) feet bentonite pellet seel above, which shall be grouped in accordance with Section 6.03.
- C. All piping materials shall be flush joint and threaded pipe. No solvent weld cements or other compounds shall be allowed. End points shall have threaded ends or be riveted on. Slip on ands are not allowed. Top caps shall be threaded or have some type of locking feature.
- D. Bentonite pellets shall have a maximum size of 1/4 inch to prevent bridging and shall then be activated with potable water.

NOV 25 '92 11:58 MPHS, SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPT.

6.05 - Protection of the Well

- A. A lockable cover shall be provided at the terminal of all well casings, and shall be so designed as to prevent any contamination from entering the well.
- H. When a well dits is to be subject to fleeding it shall be cased to a point (1) at least two (2) fast above the 100-year recurrence fleed level for the area, or (2) in the case of a flish mount, have a vatarproof seal with a lockable lockproof inner cap. When necessary, the area shall be filled with material approved by the Department, properly graded, and maintained to prevent the accumulation of recention of surface vater.
- C. Until the well is abandoned and closed in accordance with these regulations, that portion of the well above the ground level shall be protected against tampering or destruction.

6.06 - Maintenance of Wells

į

:

- A. Wells shall be maintained in an operative condition at all times in order for water samples to be collected for analytical purposes and shall have at least one (1) keyed lock to prevent tampering.
- B. All wells shall be maintained in a condition whereby they are not a hazard to health or environment nor a source of contamination to the groundwater aquifers.
- C. When a well is determined to be abandoned as defined by these rules and regulations, the owner shall be ordered to seei the well in accordance with the requirements of Section 9 of these regulations.

Section 7 -- SCIL BORINGS

7.01 -- DEPINITION OF SCIL BORINGS

Any hole that is drilled, cored, dug, washed, driven, jetted, redrilled, bored, or otherwise constructed, for the purpose of determining geological formations, water level, or for the purpose of founding structures.

APPENDIX E

.

LIST OF VENDORS AND MANUFACTURERS CONTACTED

·

 \bigcap

Ļ

.

. . .

.

water and an

Hadley Indutries 5900 West Fourth Street Ludington, MI 49431 800/345-4227

_

 $(\frown$

ŝ

Met-Pro Corporation Duall Division 1550 Industrial Drive Owosso, MI 48867 517/725-8184

North East Environmental Products 17 Technology Drive West Lebanon, NH 03784 603/298-7061

ULTROX 2435 South Anne Street Santa Ana, CA 92704-5308 714/545-5557

1. s a .

_____ a

Dear Customer:

É.

Thank you for your interest in stripping tower systems designed by Met-Pro Corporation Duall Division. I have enclosed the product information which you requested.

Our stripping tower systems are designed to remove the adorous substances and VOC's from the influent water stream. Duall manufactures the fans, duct, and towers for such systems from PVC and polypropylene for corrosionresistant service.

Met-Pro Corporation Duall Division has the experienced, multi-disciplined professional staff to aid in the design, installation, and monitoring of your air pollution control equipment. Our field technical service offers inspection and upgrading of existing equipment and addition of electrochlorination systems for on-site hypochlorite generation.

Servicing the industry since 1964 with more than 8.700 installations, Duall will provide you the benefit of our experience in air pollution control technology. We look forward to the opportunity to serve you. If you have any questions please call.

Very cruly yours.

MET-PRO CORPORATION DUALL DIVISION

211-43ST / 012492

GENERAL PRODUCTS POLLUTION CONTROL SYSTEMS. SCRUBBERS, AIR STRIPPERS, VENTILATION DUCTS, HOODS AND FANS,

BULLETIN 101-892



· ī



Odor Control Systems

Duall designs, on a day-to-day basis, customized odor-control scrubbers to meet customer specific needs. Through the use of an in-house computer, in conjunction with a highly trained lab. and chemical engineering staff, Duall can design a unit to meet even the strictest requirements. Major design onteria evaluated include: size of unit, filter packings, moisture extractor, scrubbing liquid, GPM required, and material of construction.

Services Offered

- Determine the problem
- Determine the necessary degree of control
- Select the best method of control.
- Select the proper chemistry
- Design for minimum air volume
- Provide field services, engineering, installation, start-up, and operator training

Typical Applications

- Industrial wastewater treatment.
- Municipal wastewater treatment
- Food processing
- Chemical industries
- Rendering
- Refineries
- Medical
- Found:ies
- Fish processing.

- Breweries Animal food.
- Pesticides
- Pulp and paper.
- 🗖 Тарліло
- Pharmaceutical
- Textile
- E Painting



Stripping Towers

Quall stripping towers remove Volatile Organic Compounds(VOC's) found in groundwater supplies, industrial wastewaters and process effluents.

Each stripping tower is computer-designed from an extensive data base. On-site testing is utilized when necessary.



Advantages

- Easily modified for future changes.
- Easily cleaned and maintained
- Long service life
- Simple operation
- Easy installation
- Corrosion-resistant construction
- Computer designed from extensive data pase
- Optional carbon absorbers for polishing are available.
- when required
- Low pressure drop.

Activated Carbon for Odor Control & VOC Removal



Eliminates residual. oriors emitted from municipal and industrial processes

Removes "difficult to treat" odors and eliminates remaining organic compounds from exhaust

Typical Contaminants Removed

- Hydrogen sulfide
- Mercaptans
- Ammonia^{*}

Votatile organics(VOC's)

- Amines
- Sulfur dioxide Organic acids
- Virgin carbon recommensed

Features and Benefits

- Venical, cylindrical vessels, from 2' to 12' diameter. Capacity to 1300 CFM, larger units available upon. request
- Pelletized carbon provides lower pressure drop
- Single and dual bed adsorber





Duct, Hoods & Other Specialty Thermoplastic Fabrications

Duall duct, hoods and tanks are designed for each application in accordance with standards set by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists and F OSHA.

Duall determines the amount of air required at each source affecting hood slot size, size of hood plenum and size of duct.

The best corrosion-resistant material for construction is selected for duct and hoods using the highest quality PVC, CPVC, PP, PVDF, HDPE, FRP and PVC/FRP overlay.

Duall has the highest standards and the most advanced equipment for manufacturing

Advantages

- Lightweight for ease of installation.
- Computer designed
- Best corrosion-resistant material for application
- Highest manufacturing stanoards

Designed and manufactured to ACGIH and SMACNA.
 Standards



38 **2**31

Centrifugal Fans

Duall offers a wide selection of corrosion-resistant centrilugal fans to handle even the most difficult applications. Standard materials of construction are fiberglass reinforced plastic (FRP), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), and polypropylene (PP). Optional materials of construction are polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF), polyethylene (HDPE), high temperature PVC (CPVC) and stainless steel.

Advantages

- 100% corrosion-resistant
- 40 to over 60,000 CFM available
- FB Models up to 14° S.F.
- Temperatures to over 200° F
- Electronically balanced
- Rugged construction
- Quiet operation
- Quick, easy installation
- High efficiency, economical operation
- Low maintenance





Emergency Gas Scrubbers

No external fan required—maximizes reliability and minimizes capital and maintenance costs

 Excellent for treatment and control of sudden releases of toxic gases

Especially useful in the water treatment and chemical process industries.

Combine the particulate removal and gas moving features of an ejector with the gas absorption quality of a packed lower

TYPICAL APPLICATIONS

- Suttur dioxide
- Ammonia
- Chlorine

SPECIAL FEATURES

- Gas detection available for selected applications
- Flow rates from 50 10,000 CFM.
- Corrosion resistant construction available in PVC.

polypropylene, liberglass and a variety of dual laminates. Particulate removal

Self-contained recirculation

Ejector Tower Scrubbers

Compact, highly efficient scrubbers designed for vapor deposition reactors, cylinder cabinets, chemical storage tanks, chlorine scrubbing and low- volume exhaust applications.

- Ideal for particulate removal
- No external fan
- Flow rates to 300 CFM in standard models
- Skid mounted
- Sell contained recirculation
- Stationary or portable installations
- Minimum hook-ups—fresh water, drain, electrical power, chemical leed
- pH and ORP control packages available
- Fittings to connect nitrogen purge gas
- Full one-year warranty

38 232

A Partial List of Duall's Major Customers

Tunker Air Force Baso Oklahoma City, OK

RCI, Riviera Beach, FL

Regional Wastewater Facility Gape May County, NJ

Senders Brothers Co. Overtand Park, KS

Airco Research Triangle Park, NC

Prati & Whitney Bridgeport, WV

Midwost Aluminum Kalamazoo, Mi

Xerox, Webster, NY

Greenwood Plating Greenwood, SC

Allied Finishing Grand Flapids, <u>MI</u>

Eastern Radiation Env. Montgomeny, AL

IBM Material Distribution Center Endecott, NY

AT&T Solid State Tech. Upper Macungio, PA

Chem-Tronics, El Cajon, CA

Keeter Brass Grand Rapids, MI

Lakeland City Wastewater Treatment Plant Lakeland, FL

McGraw-Edison Albion, MI

Tusas Aerospace Ind. Islanbul, Turkey

Keloo Div, ol Marck & Co San Diego, CA

Unarco, Wagoner, OK

Town of Westerly Westerly, Al

Anomatic Westerville, OH

Pacelic Chiorida Columbus, GA

Peace Sun Pkg. 16" Project Test, Saudi Arabia

American Can. Graphics Center Battle Creck, MI

City of Detroit • • Water & Sewer Detroit, MI

(BM, Tech, Development Endicon, NY

Raytheon Co. Wallham, MA Caterpillar Aurora, IL

Columbia Intl. Ltd. Longueuil, Ovebec TRW Aincraft Components Minerva, OH

Philips Labs Briandd' Manor, NY

Ford Motor Co. Mi. Clemens, MI

Birdview Satellite Olathe, KS

Stanley Plating Forestville, CT

MacDermid, Inc. Waterbury, CT

Automata, Inc. Reston, VA

Wang Labs Mathuèn, MA

Terridyne Inc. Nashua, NJ

Isotronics, Inc. New Bectlord, MA

King Radio, Olathe, KS

Goetze Mantowac, Wi

Avco Systems Div. Wilmington, MA

Gillette Co. Boston, MA

United Tech., Sikorsky Alicraft Svallord, CT

MacDermid, Inc. Ferntale, MI

Dougtas Aircraft Torrance, CA Long Beach, CA

G, A. Technology San Diego, CA

Cardinal Aburticium Louisville, KY

Charlesten Naval Shipyard Charleston, SC

El Paso Wastowaler Treatment Plant El Paso, TX

Indian Creek Kansas Cdy, <u>MO</u>

Cooper Industries Missouri City, TX

Chautauqua Wastewator Treatment Plant Chautauqua, NY

Problem Solving

People - the heart of the company- dedicated to the design, production and servicing of quality products, ensuring our reputation for excellence.

People - with experience in all facets of business, from management, engineering, sales, and production through installation. Not just keeping pace with the industry but providing leadership. The longevity of our employees is a testimony to our commitment and assurance of quality. It is considered to be a personal challenge to this company to solve your problems. through this breadth of experience.

Experienced Local Representatives

- Trained air-pollution specialists
- Over 50 offices nationwide plus international representation

In-House Engineers

Dedicated professional staff—chemical, civil, mechanical engineers.

Project Engineers

 Extensive background—engineering, manufacturing, installation.

Total responsibility from order through shipment and beyond

Manufacturing Personnel

Highly trained, motivated and quality conscious employees.

Trained Installers

Experienced personnel—basic supervision with full turn-key capabilities

Quality Assurance

Corrosion-resistant, warranted air-pollution control equipment and ventilation systems. These products offer long life and proven performance at affordable prices, and are your assurance of satisfaction in meeting the requirements of specifications and governmental regulations.

Wet Scrubbers

Standard or custom-engineered models, wide selection, high efficiency, corrosion-resistant, long life, low water consumption, minimum maintenance.

38 **2** 3

Corrosion Resistant Fans

Broad performance, quiet operation, rugged construction, electronically balanced

Duct Systems—Exhaust Hoods

 Efficiently designed, energy-conserving, corrosion-resistant, lightweight, attractive

Oil Mist Eliminator

Efficient, compact, self-powered, versatile.

Chemical Mist Eliminator

- Standard or custom-engineered models
- Dry or wet operation

Air Stripping Towers

Removes Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC's) from groundwater.

Efficiencies

Modern labor-saving facilities enable Duall to be a leader in the design and development of new and improved tabrication. methods, keeping your costs low. Two manufacturing plants insure timely delivery of your order.

Over 60,000 square, ft., labor-saving equipment, research. and development laboratory

Total Service

More than an equipment producer, Duall emphasizes the total service approach to customer problems. Dedication to customer satisfaction is the hallmark of Duall's service policy. After-the-sale service is important, and Duall provides it on a highly professional level.

Customer Services

Specification writing assistance, system design, field management, installation, start-up, operation and maintenance. training, warranty service.

Special Services

- Pilol studies, on-site testing, lab studies
- Air permit assistance
- Design/build engineering

2COPYRIGHT 1992 MET-PRO CORPORATION, DUALL DIVISION

OUALL DIVISION IS A REGISTERED TRADEMARK OF MET-PRO CORPORATION

11-5000 892

. . Re



1550 INDUSTRIAL DRIVE, OWOSSO, MI 48867 (517)725-8184, FAX (517)725-8188

epresented by:	



:



AIR-STRIPPING COLUMNS

DUALL experience saves time and money from specification to start-up

The ready availability of potable water is one of our most pressing problems. Evidence is increasing that the supply is shrinking, and more and more of the available water is contaminated with volatile organic compounds (VOC's), usually chlorinated solvents. Consumer pressure, as well as governmental regulations federal, state and local — are demanding effective and prompt action to preserve water availability for both human and industrial use. Duall is in a unique position to meet the industry's needs for efficient, cost-effective VQC removal.

Many organic compounds are found in groundwater supplies, industrial wastewaters and process effluents. Some dissolved gases, hydrogen sulfide, ammonia and CO_2 occur naturally; still other manufactured chemicals are found as contaminants. There are hundreds of potential pollutants that may be removed by air stripping. The ease of stripping depends on a particular compound's vapor/liquid equilibrium constant (VLE). In turn the VLE is influenced by temperature, other contaminants present and general chemistry of the water.

More and more engineering firms and consultants rely on Duall's many years of mass transfer experience. We work closely with the project manager to ensure that our portion of a complete system performs as expected. We do not compete with Design/Engineering Service Firms — rather we enhance the project manager's success by providing our expertise and experience in pollution control technologies and equipment.

The result of this cooperation is the "optimum" stripping column system, neither over- nor under-engineered. It will deliver the required efficiency at the required liquid capacity (from 5 gpm to 3000 gpm), while operating at minimum pressure drop. Duall stripping columns are fabricated of corrosion-resistant materials, facilitating ease of cleaning and maintenance. These strippers can be readily modified to meet future requirements. Turnkey installation is available, with on-time delivery, optimum energy efficiency and a one-year warranty.

Clearly, the Duall way is the efficient way — in completeness of design, economy, delivery, performance, and satisfaction.



A typical PVC-constructed air stripping column, designed for 99.9 percent removal afficiency of 1,1,1trichtoroethane, toluene and trichtoroethylene from a 20-25 gpm well source. This 28' tower was provided complete, with self-cleaning option and motor starter control panel. System was in operation three weeks after design approval. The tower operates yearround at a site on the east coast. Performance exceeds requirements.

One of the largest single tower stripping columns in operation in this country, this Duall unit was designed to remove TCE and other VOCs to less than 1 part per billion. It consistently performs above specifications. The 12'6" diameter by 30' high stripper processes from a 3,000 gpm well water source. The unit leatures high efficiency packing and all PVC construction, Two PVC fans provide the air supply; one fan is for emergency backup. Starter and afarm panels were supplied by Duall, as was installation and start-up service.



SAMPLE TAPS

DEMISTER SECTION

Here is the most efficient, cost-effective answer to VOC removal, degasification and odor elimination

Buy only what you need with guaranteed performance. Advantages include:

- Removal rates exceeding 99.9% for many VOC's
- Capacities from 5 gpm to 3,000 gpm in single-column applications
- Computer design

ł

П

11

: 2

٦

зİ

J

- Laboratory feasibility testing
- Pilot testing services
- Rental columns available
- Corrosion-resistant construction
- · Complete packaged systems on-site
- Rapid field assembly and reduced field time
- Installation start-up services
- Carbon adsorption units available for exhaust air purification
- Many other optional features, such as self-cleaning and automatic monitoring, provide safer, unattended operation

All columns are not created equal!

You cannot afford failure when dealing with toxic chemicals. Our experience is your assurance that Duall air stripping columns are the answer to your VOC removal problems. Duall performs.

A typical Duall Air Stripping System consists of a vertical packed tower with a fresh air blower and pump. The stripping process is carried out in a countercurrent contacting column. Polluted water is distributed over a carefully selected packing material and cascades down to the bottom drain. Fresh air is forced up through the packing. The air continuously contacts a large water surface and contaminants are transferred to the air. In order to achieve the desired removal afficiency, the thermodynamic processes must be matched to the proper column characteristics. Such important variables as column loading, gasto-liquid ratio, temperature, air distribution and others must be considered to produce an optimum column. Duall uses a computer simulator, cafibrated from actual field tests to design every column.



Duall provides installation service to assure on-site performance



Duall's concern with efficient design and construction does not end with shipment to the customer. We provide installation service as an extension of our expertise in system engineering. Duall-supplied columns, whether pilot or permanent, are quickly erected at the jobsite from factory matchmarked components. Winter/summer operating data and actual field performance testing allows Duall to offer performance guarantees.

> NOTE: Activated Carbon or Catalytic decomposition may be required to meet air emission stancards. Selection of air emission control depends on many factors. In general, the tower design must be optimized if air emission controls are required. Heating the water or air may be desirable to reduce total cost of owning and operating the system. All services are reasonably priced. Contact Duall for your air-stripping needs.

- 22 YEARS OF POLLUTION CONTROL EXPERIENCE
- ENGINEERED SYSTEMS = SCRUBBERS FANS
- OIL AND CHEMICAL MIST ELIMINATORS
- DUCTWORK . MOISTURE EXTRACTORS
- CUSTOM FABRICATIONS
- CORROSION RESISTANT CONSTRUCTION: PVC, FRP, STAINLESS STEEL, ETC.



Main Office: .

700 S. McMillan Street Owosso, MI 48867-0769 Telephone: (517) 725-8184 Telex 22-8532 102 Hillside Drive Forest City, NC 28043-1000 Telephone (704) 245-8725 Telex 80-2210

REPRESENTED BY:



You requested more information...

Enclosed is material that describes our modular line of ShallowTray[™] aeration systems for stripping volatile contaminants from water.

The systems - using simple, patented ShallowTray technology - come in a variety of models for treatment rates ranging from 1 gpm to 200 gpm⁻. Removal efficiencies (based on your site's effluent requirements) are achieved by adding trays.

Each unit is typically fabricated from stainless steel and instrumented to your specifications. Molded polyethylene residential Point-Of-Entry models and 1-12 gpm groundwater remediation systems are also available.

Please call me if we can assist you in removing VOC's or Radon from water...or if you would like a proposal that is specific to your project.

Sincerely,

Barry Clarke Customer Service

Enclosures

"Designs for greater treatment rates on request.

As a manufacturer of top quality and tripping systems since 1983, North East Environmental Products is committed to improving groundwater so that it will be clean and safe for people.



17 Technology Drive West Lebanon, NH 03784 603-298-7061

The ShallowTray[™] Process



This illustration is representative of the ShallowTray[®] Model 2611.

Protected under U.S. Patent No. 5,045,215. Other U.S. and International Patents Pending.

Hooto on front cover: top view of 2300 Series seration tray in action. Photo on back cover: cross section of a Shallow Tray in action (full scale).

ShallowTray is a trademark of North East Environmental Products. Inc. © 1992 North East Environmental Products. Inc. Our policy is one of continual improvement and we reserve the

Low Profile

The discreet size of a ShallowTray¹⁰ air stripper does not advertise a contamination site. It is easily accessed for maintenance and can be installed inside a building. The system is also ideal as a trailermounted, portable stripper for pump tests, pilot studies, short-term cleanup, or emergency response. There is no tower. be easily cleaned through ports using a washing wand and pressure washer. Trays can also be easily removed for a thorough inspection and cleaning.

Full Range Turndown

Not only are ShallowTray systems forgiving of "surprise" inorganics in the water, they also allow operation anywhere within the rated flow range. In

Treatment

The ShallowTray process uses forced draft, countercurrent air stripping through baffled aeration trays to remove volatile organic compounds from water.

Contaminated water is sprayed into the inlet chamber through a coarse mist spray nozzle. The water flows over a flow distribution weir and along the baffled acration tray. Air, blown up through %6" diameter holes in the aeration tray, forms a froth of bubbles generating a large mass transfer surface The air forms a froth of bubbles approximately 6 inches deep on the acration tray, generating a large mass transfer surface area where the contaminants are volatilized.

38

241



holes in the aeration tray.

fact, as the flow rate is reduced, performance increases. Also, as demands change (stricter effluent contaminant levels) so can the ShallowTray system. Its modular design allows for the addition of trays which increase the percent removal of contaminants.

No Disposal

ShallowTray systems have no packing or diffusers to contend with and no costs associated with GAC breakthrough, fouling or disposal and replacement.

System Size

To determine the system

area where the contaminants are volatilized. The necessary contact or residence time to reach required volatilization is achieved through model size, addition of trays, and flow rate selection.

Resistant to Fouling

ShallowTray systems are resistant to fouling problems. Treatment trays have large ³/₆" diameter aeration holes. In addition, the turbulent action of the froth scours the surfaces of the tray reducing build-up of oxidized iron.

If, under extreme conditions, oxidized iron accumulates or hardness begins to scale up, trays can size required for your site, first identify the flow rate. This guides you to the ShallowTray Series needed. As an example, with a flow rate of 30gpm, select the 2600 Series, which is rated for flows from 1 to 50gpm.

Next, identify the contaminants present and the removal requirement. Generally, this determines the number of trays required. However, the graphs in this brochure should be used as a guideline only. For a proposal, send us or your representative the specifications. Request for Quotation sheets are available.

52 A.



ULTROX

A Division of Resources Conservation Company

2435 South Anne Streel Sania Ana, CA 92704-5308 Phone: 714 545-5557 Fax: 714 557-5398

December 3, 1992

Mr. Dan Currenze Engineer Science 425 Woods Mills Road South, Suite 150 Chesterfield, Missouri 63017

Dear Mr. Currenze:

It was good talking with you today. Literature on ULTROX• advanced oxidation processes has been enclosed, as you requested.

Ultrox processes provide solutions to complex environmental problems by destroying air and water borne toxic organics <u>on-site</u>, thereby eliminating the potential residual liability associated with older technologies. The patented ULTROX® process utilizes ultraviolet light with ozone and hydrogen peroxide to destroy a wide range of organic compounds in water, including many on the EPA's priority pollutant list. Phenols, aromatic solvents, including BTEX, M.T.B.E., chlorinated solvents, PCBs, PCP, explosives in water and pesticides, are examples of toxics that are destroyed in ULTROX® systems.

ULTROX® processes overcome the problems associated with other treatment methods, as the altimate products of the process are trace salts, CO_2 and H_2O_2 . In contrast to air stripping or activated carbon, <u>no toxics are emitted to the atmosphere or adsorbed onto media which require landfill disposal or regeneration</u>. ULTROX® processes can be run continuously or intermittently, which is an advantage over biological processes that are affected adversely by variations in flow rate or contaminant type and concentration.

Commercial application of advanced oxidation technology began over ten years ago with the installation of an ULTROX® system at IBM's Boulder, Colorado, facility. Acceptance of ULTROX® technology has grown rapidly, with commercial systems in operation at many Fortune 500 companies today. Installed system capacities vary from 1.0 G.P.M. to 1100 G.P.M., with total installed processing capacity in excess of 1.2 billion gallons per year.

System specifications are developed on the basis of extensive laboratory and commercial application data bases and/or bench scale treatability studies conducted at our laboratory facilities. Skid-mounted pilot plant units also are available for use at the customer job site to acquire additional design data when necessary.

ULTROX[®] systems are manufactured for lease or outright purchase. Rental units also are available for short-term clean up applications. Full service maintenance contracts also are available on request.

ULTROX[®] processes are used as a stand-alone treatment process or as part of a treatment train in tandem with processes such as ultrafiltration, biotreatment, activated carbon or metals removal. ULTROX[®] equipment and service is guaranteed to provide the performance required to ensure that the end user consistently remains in compliance with their regulatory guidelines.

Thank you for your interest in ULTROX• Advanced Oxidation Processes. Please contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

William D. Hondbaugh

William S. Himebaugh National Sales Manager

WSH/mms Enclosure: Literature Package



How the Ultrox process destroys organics.



 Hydrogen peroxide and ozone are added to water containing organics; this example shows trichloroethylene (TCE).

2. Ultraviolet light provides the energy to break up hydrogen peroxide and ozone into hydroxyl radicals. These radicals and the ultraviolet light attack the organic and break its chemical bonds.

3. Carbon dioxide and water are the end products, along with inorganic chlorides.



The Ultrox process uses ultraviolet light, ozone and hydrogen peroxide to destroy toxic organics.

38 246

Why move organics from one place to another?

To get rid of organics in water, you can remove them with carbon or strip them with air. But then they're left in a carbon bed or released into the atmosphere.

Ultrox has a better way-destroy the organics.

The Ultrox process uses ultraviolet light, ozone and hydrogen peroxide (UV/Oxidation) to break down toxic organics into harmless organic acids, carbon dioxide, water and trace salts. Results: no disposal costs and reduced liability.

Ultrox treats:

- groundwater
- drinking water
- · process water
- industrial
- wastewater
- high purity.
- cooling water
- leachate

Ultrox destroys:

- chlorinated solvents
 - BTEX compounds
 - PCBs
 - semivolatile compounds
 - pesticides
- phenois
- cyanides

The Ultrox advantage.

Commercially proven.

Ultrox has been in the UV/Oxidation business since 1984. Industries served include electric utility, aerospace, electronics, petroleum, wood treating and chemical processing as well as municipalities, DOD and DOE facilities. See the back page for selected case studies,



An Ultrox pilot plant may be installed on site to demonstrate the effectiveness of the UV/Oxidation process.

Low energy.

The patented combination of UV light with ozone and hydrogen peroxide allows Ultrox to use efficient, low intensity lamps.

Compact.

Ultrox systems are modular, compact and transportable for easy on-site installation.

Automatic.

Ultrox systems are automatic in a continuous flow or batch mode and require little monitoring.

Low maintenance.

UV tamps last more than 9000 hours. The ozone generator dielectric cells require cleaning once every two years.

Compatible.

Ultrox systems can be integrated with carbon treatment, bioremediation and other technologies for enhanced cleanup.

Demonstrable.

Ultrox maintains a laboratory fully equipped to determine system performance on particular water streams. An Ultrox pilot plant can be installed on site to demonstrate effectiveness under actual operating conditions.

How industry is using the Ultrox process.



Input: 210 gpm of groundwater with 7000 ppb TCE, DCE, methylene chloride. Output: <4 ppb total VOCs.



Input: 1150 gpm of groundwater with 20 ppb PCE. Output: <0.2 ppb PCE.



Input:100 gpm groundwater with 1500 ppb TCE, PCE, vinyl chloride, TCA, DCA. Output: drinking water standards.

U.S. Bureau of Engraving



Input: 50 gpm of wastewater from printing operation with 183 ppm cyanides. Output: < 2 ppm cyanides.

Give us a call.

í.

For more information on the Ultrox process, call or fax with your water treatment needs.

© 1992 Resources Conservation Company. All rights reserved. Ustroa[®] is a registered trademark of Resources Conservation Company.

ULTROX

A Division of Resources Conservation Company

2435 South Anne Street Sania Ana, CA 92704-5308 Phone: 714 545-5557 Fax: 714 557-5396



🖸 A Halliburton Company

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

(

(

(___

د ^ا دهمر ا<u>حمر</u>

- --

APPENDIX F

-

í

COST ESTIMATES

an saise

÷

• • • • •

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

ing Line and

:

Project: Removal Action for Ground Water Defense Distribution Region Central, Memphis Tennessee

By: Engineering-Science, Inc. / St. Louis, MO 08/19/93

Cost Summary by Alternative

<i>.</i> .	Alt	ernative	Capital (1993 \$)	Annual 0 & M (1993 \$)	Net Present Value (10 yrs) 8.0%
		2	\$599,478	\$270,187	\$2,233,756
		3	\$604,293	\$229,327	\$1,984,349
		4	\$825,248	\$303,487	\$2,649,696
		5	\$471,078	\$131,000	\$1,250,092
		6	\$659,398	\$163,500	\$1,626,386
		7	\$498,213	\$149,200	\$1,388,294
	Metals T	reatment	\$1,089,260	\$102,500	\$1,645,411

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

:

	ALTERNATIVE 2 COST EST	TIMATE			08/19/93
	On-Site Extraction, Air Strippi	ing, POI	ſW		
Projec	t: Removal Action for Ground Wa	iter		Mannaggaa	
	Defense Distribution Region Cer	ntral, P	Nemphis	Tennessee	Cost
Item				Cest	Evtonsion
No	Item Qi	lantity	Units	ÇQSC	Excension
CAPIT?	AL COSTS				
100	EXTRACTION WELLS	_		CA 000	64 000
101	Mobilization	1	LS	54,000	\$4,000 633 400
102	Well Drilling, 7 new wells	560	TF.	540	\$22,400
103	Split Spoon Sampling	28	ea	\$20 ¢eo	0000
104	6-inch ID St. Steel Casing	350		200	\$20,000 \$27 300
105	6-inch ID St. Steel Screen	210	LF	513U	527,300
106	Well Installation	560	LF	\$15 ¢2 000	30,400 CD1 000
107	Well development	7	ea	\$3,000	321,000
110	Well Vault/Head completion	8	ea	\$5,000	\$40,000
111	Metering/B'flow prev	8	ea	\$1,500	\$12,000
117	Pining, Pump Discharge	600	LF	56	\$3,600
116	Flee Pump 75 gpm	8	ea	\$1,500	\$12,000
120	Flee Controls	8	ea	\$2,000	\$16,000
121	Flog Power Distribution	2,000	LF	\$15	\$30,000
122	Diming Collection Installed	2,000	\mathbf{LF}	\$10	\$20,000
130	MERING, COTTECCTOR INCOLLECT	- •			
200	Cite Drop/Concrete Pad	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000
210	Nie Chripping Tower, 520 gpm	1	ea	\$75,000	\$75,000
220	Air Stripping lower, sto ypa	1	ea	\$9,000	\$9,000
230	Blower Fan, 1,000 acra	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000
231	Elec Controls	1	ea	\$5,000	\$5,000
232	Metering, Incluent riping	POSAL		•	
300	ON-SITE PIPING FOR WATER DIDI	300	LF	\$20	\$6,000
310	10-INCH PVC Sewer	200		-	
400	OFF-SITE SEWER UPGRADES	3 000	LF	\$54.00	\$162,000
410	15-Inch VCP sewer	5,000	ea	\$3,000	\$18,000
420	Manholes 1 per 500 Lr	•		•••	
	and a sub-time deat	7 00		struction	\$39,218
	Estimated Design Cost	7.00			
		2 - TO	tal Can'	ital Costs	\$599,478
	Alternative	2 - 10	car cap.		
		ATTIN T			
OPERI	ATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS, AN	500	hre	\$30.00	\$15,000
900	Environmental Technician	500	well	\$1.000	\$8,000
911	Wells Eqt Repairs/replacement	1	03	\$12,000	\$12,000
912	Treat Eqt Repairs/replacement	00 000	KMH	\$0.08	\$6,400
921	Electrical Costs	20,000	000 02	1 \$0.60	\$163,987
922	Sewer Use Charges	213,312	comple	= \$300	\$16,800
930	Laboratory Analysis	50	Sambie	\$4,000	\$48,000
940	Reporting/Record Keeping	12	що	<i>44,000</i>	
	11+ armative	2 - TO	tal O &	M Costs	\$270,187
	Alfefugeide			_	
	$r_{\text{respective}} = (1003 \text{ S})$ for 10 V	ears	8.00	<pre>% Interest</pre>	\$2,233,756
Net	Present value (1995 V) tot to 1 10 Ve	ar cost	. per 1,	000 gallon	s \$0.817

51
APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

-

.

-

	ALTERNATIVE 3 COST On- & Off-Site Extraction &	ESTIMATE	ning DC		08/19/93
Project: Removal Action for Ground Water					
	Defense Distribution Region	Central,	Memphis	Tennessee	
Item	L	•	•	Unit	Cost
No	Item	Quantit	y Units	Cost	Extension
CAPI	TAL COSTS	_	• • • • • • • •		LA CENSION
100	EXTRACTION WELLS				
101	Mobilization	1	LS	\$4.000	\$4.000
102	Well Drilling, 7 new wells	560	LP	\$40	\$22,400
103	Split Spoon Sampling	28	ea	\$20	\$560
104	6-inch ID St. Steel Casing	350	ĹF	\$80	\$28,000
105	6-inch ID St. Steel Screen	210	LF	\$130	\$27 300
106	Well Installation	560	LF	\$15	\$27,500
107	Well development	7	 	\$3.000	\$0,400
110	Well Vault/Head completion	. 8	ea	\$5,000	\$40,000
111	Metering/B'flow prev	л В	ea	\$1 500	\$40,000
112	Piping, Pump Discharge	600	LF	\$1,500	\$12,000
120	Elec Pump, 75 gpm	2000	03	\$1 500	\$3,600
121	Elec Controls	2	ea 93	\$1,500	\$12,000
122	Elec Power Distribution	3 000	еа. тъ	32,000	\$16,000
130	Piping, Collection Installed	3,000		\$10 ¢10	\$45,000
200	TREATMENT SYSTEM	5,000	ЦĽ	\$T0	\$30,000
210	Site Pren/Concrete Bad	•		***	•••
220	Air Stripping Towar 400 mm	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000
230	Blower Fan BOO gaft	1	ea	\$68,000	\$68,000
231	Flec Controla	1	ea	\$7,500	\$7,500
212	metering Influent Divi	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000
300	ON-SITE DIDING FOR WARD DI	1	ea	\$5,000	\$5,000
310	10-jpch BVC cover	SPOSAL			
400	OFF-FIRE CEVER	300	LF	\$20	\$6,000
410	JE TEEL NOD THE				
410	Marbalas 1 Son La	3,000	LF	\$50. 00	\$150,000
420	Mannoles I per 500 LF	6	ea	\$3,000	\$18,000
	Estimated Design Cost	7.00%	of Cons	struction	\$39,533
	Alternative	e 3 - Tot	al Capit	tal Costs	\$604,293
OPERA	TION AND MAINTENANCE CORDO AN				
900	Environmental Technician	INUAL	•	.	
911	Wells Fat Persive/replacement	500	nrs	\$30.00	\$15,000
912	Treat For Bonaive/vealesant	8	well	\$1,000	\$8,000
971	Flectrical Costs	1	ea	\$12,000	\$12,000
921		62,000	KWH	\$0.08	\$4,960
928	Johomater Das Las	207,612	000 gal	\$0.60	\$124,567
930	Deporting (Depart)	56	samples	\$300	\$16,800
340	Reporting/Record Reeping	12	mο	\$4,000	\$48,000
				1	======
	Alternative	: 3 - Tot	al O & M	(Costs	\$229,327
Net D	$\mathbf{recent Value (1002 C) } \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}$				
nee P	rescur varue (TAA3 2) IOL 10 Å	ears	8.00%	Interest \$	1,984,349
	10 year cost per 1,000 gallons \$0.956				

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

÷...

	ALTERNATIV	E 4 COST	ESTIMATE			08/19/93
On-Site Extraction, UV/Oxidation, POTW						
Project: Removal Action for Ground Water						
-	Defense Distributio	n Region C	entral,	Memphis	Tennessee	Cont
Item					Unit	Eutopaion
No	Item		Quantity	Units	Cost	Extension
CAPIT	L COSTS					
100	EXTRACTION WELLS				Č . 000	64 000
101	Mobilization		1	LS	\$4,000	\$4,000
102	Well Drilling, 7 n	ew wells	560	LF	54U 620	\$22,400
103	Split Spoon Samplin	lg j	28	ea	520	\$500 \$78 000
104	6-inch ID St. Steel	Casing	350	LF.	30U 6120	\$28,000
105	6-inch ID St. Steel	Screen	210	LF	9130 C1E	\$27,500
106	Well Installation		560	1.E	67 000	\$0,400
107	Well development		<i>'</i>	ea	\$5,000	\$21,000
110	Well Vault/Head con	pletion	8	ea	\$5,000	\$12,000
111	Metering/B'flow pre	5 A	8	ea	\$1,500 ¢¢	\$12,000
112	Piping, Pump Discha	irge	600	L.P	20 21 500	\$17,000
120	Elec Pump, 75 gpm		8	ea	\$1,500 \$2,000	\$16,000
121	Elec Controls		8	ea	\$2,000	\$10,000
122	Elec Power Distribu	ntion	2,000		910 610	\$30,000
130	Piping, Collection	Installed	2,000	LF.	\$10	320,000
200	TREATMENT SYSTEM		_		650 000	\$50 000
210	Site Prep/Building		1	ea	\$50,000	\$30,000
220	UV Oxidation unit,	520 gpm	1	ea	\$200,000	\$200,000
230	Chemical Storage/Ha	andling	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000
231	Elec Controls		1	ea	\$30,000	\$30,000 65 000
232	Metering, Influent	Piping	1	ęa	\$5,000	\$5,000
240	Effluent Sump		1	ea	\$25,000	\$25,000
241	Effluent Pump/Pipin	ng	1	ea	\$10,000	\$10,000
300	ON-SITE PIPING FO	R WATER DI	SPOSAL		690	\$6 000
310	10-inch PVC sewer		300	LF.	\$ ∠ 0	\$0,000
400	OFF-SITE SEWER UP	GRADES			064 00	6162 000
410	15-Inch VCP sewer		3,000	۲	\$04.00 ¢2.000	\$18,000
420	Manholes 1 per 500	LF	6	ea	\$3,000	ş18,000
					+	CEJ 088
	Estimated	Design Co	s 7.00	tor cons	LIUCLION	
				hal Cani	tal Coste	\$825 248
		Alternativ	e 4 - 10	cai capi	Lai Cosca	3025,240
			STRUCT B			
OPERA	TION AND MAINTENANC	E COSTS, A	NNUAL	bre	\$30.00	\$15,000
900	Environmental Tech	nician	500	hrs	\$60.00	\$12,000
901	UV Sys Engr		- 200	wall	\$1 000	\$8.000
911	Wells Eqt Repairs/	replacemen	1L 0	weii	\$12,000	\$12,000
912	Treat Eqt Repairs/	repiacemen		ęa Vulu	\$0 08	\$16,000
921	Electrical Costs		200,000		\$0.00	\$163 987
922	Sewer Use Charges		273,312		\$0.00 \$0.45	\$11 700
923	Hydrogen Peroxide	-	20,000	TDS/AL	, ¢100	S16 800
930	Laboratory Analysi	S	30	Sambres	000 kg	\$48 000
940	Reporting/Record K	eeping	TX	ОШ	34,000	==========
			ю 4 – ^т -	tal 0 f	M Costs	\$303.487
		Alternativ	4 - 10		H COACA	\$2,649,696
Net F	resent value (1993	5] IOF 10	AGAT 2004	ner 1 /)00 dellore	\$0.969
10 year cost per 1,000 gallons 30.90						

38 253

1.5 25.00

 $r \rightarrow r$

-

.....

.

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

	ATTERNATIVE 5 COST EST	TMATE			08/19/93
	ALTERNATIVE 5 COOL DO	ing. Sur	face D	rainage	
D	the Borowal Action for Ground Wa	ater			
Projec	Defence Distribution Region Cer	ntral, M	lemphis	Tennessee	
T b a a	Derense Discribición Region de		•	Unit	Cost
ren	7507 01	antity	Units	Cost	Extension
NO		-		:	
CAPITA	TYMPACTION WELLS			:	
100	EXTRACIION WELLS	1	LS	\$4,000	\$4,000
101	$\frac{MODIIIZaCIUM}{MODIIIZaCIUM} = 7 \text{ new Wells}$	560	LF	\$40	\$22,400
102	Well Drilling, / new wells	28	ea	\$20	\$560
103	Split spoon sampling	350	LF	\$80	\$28,000
104	6-inch ID St. Steel Casing	210	I.F	\$130	\$27,300
105	6-inch ib St. Steel Screen	560	LF	\$15	\$8,400
106	Well Installation	200		\$3.000	\$21,000
107	Well development	, e	03	\$5,000	\$40,000
110	Well Vault/Head completion	0	eu 03	\$1,500	\$12,000
111	Metering/B'flow prev	C 0 0		56	\$3,600
112	Pip in g, Pump Discharge	600		\$1 500	\$12,000
120	Elec Pump, 75 gpm	8	ea	\$1,500	\$16,000
121	Elec Controls	8	ea	\$2,000 ¢15	\$20,000
122	Elec Power Distribution	2,000		\$10 \$10	\$30,000
130	Piping, Collection Installed	2,000	LF	\$10	920,000
200	TREATMENT SYSTEM				ADD 000
210	Site Prep/Concrete Pad	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000
220	Air Stripping Tower, 520 gpm	1	ea	\$75,000	\$75,000
220	Blower Fan. 1.000 scfm	1	ea	\$9,000	\$9,000
200	Flec Controls	1	ea	\$20,000	520,000
231	Watering Influent Piping	1	ea	\$5,000	\$5,000
222	Effluent Sumn	1	ea	\$25,000	\$25, 0 00
240	Effluent Dump/Pining	1	ea	\$10,000	\$10,000
241	ON STOR DIDING FOR WATER DISP	POSAL			
300	UN-SITE FIFING FOR WAILER DECK	1.000	\mathbf{LF}	\$25	\$25,000
310	10-1nch Force Main	1	ea	\$6,000.00	\$6,000
320	Discharge headwall	-		, , ,	
	Ceat	7.003	t of Co	nstruction	\$30,818
	Estimated Design Cost			••	
	Thomstitte	5 - Tot	tal Can	ital Costs	\$471,078
	Alfernarise	5 10.	cur oup		
		TTTA T			
OPER/	ATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS, AND	NUAL 500	bre	\$30.00	\$15.000
900	Environmental Technician	500	wall	\$1,000	\$8,000
911	Wells Eqt Repairs/replacement	· •	WEII	\$12,000	512,000
912	Treat Eqt Repairs/replacement	1	ea	\$12,000 ¢n ng	\$7 200
921	Electrical Costs	90,000	KWH	- \$200	\$40,800
930	Laboratory Analysis	136	sample	000 63	· \$40,000
940	Reporting/Record Keeping	12	mo	\$4,000	
	-			V. Costa	\$131 000
	Alternative	5 - то	car Q &	M COSES	4101,000
				a Tatawart	\$1 250 AD2
Net	Present Value (1993 \$) for 10 y	ears	8.00	A INCERESC	- ¢Λ /57
	10 ye	ar cost	per 1,	you gailon	5 QU,401

یکن انکی در <u>ماند م</u>

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

•• •

	ALTERNATIVE 6 COST ES	TIMATE			08/19/93	
on-Site Extraction IN/Oxidation. Surface Drainage						
Drojec	t. Removal Action for Ground W	later		2		
FIOJEC	Defense Distribution Region Co	entral. 1	Memphis	Tennessee		
Thom	Derense Distribution hogien of		-	Unit	Cost	
Ne	Itom (mantity	Units	Cost	Extension	
NO CADITA	1 COSTC 1					
LAPLIA	EVERACETON WELLS					
100	Mobilization	1	LS	\$4,000	\$4,000	
101	Woll Drilling 7 new wells	560	LF	\$40	\$22,400	
102	Calit Speen Sampling	28	ea	\$20	\$560	
103	Spiil spoon sampling	350	LF	\$80	\$28,000	
104	G-INCH ID St. Steel Casing	210	LF	\$130	\$27,300	
105	6-inch ID St. Steel Screen	560	L.F	\$15	\$8,400	
106	Well installation		63	\$3,000	\$21,000	
107	Well development	,	ea 43	\$5,000	\$40,000	
110	Well Vault/Head Completion	0 0	ea 03	\$1,500	\$12,000	
111	Metering/B'flow prev	<pre>0</pre>	ea TE	\$1,500	\$3,600	
112	Piping, Pump Discharge	БОО		C1 500	\$12,000	
120	Elec Pump, 75 gpm	8	ea	\$1,000	\$12,000	
121	Elec Controls	8	ea	\$2,000	\$10,000	
122	Elec Power Distribution	2,000	LF.	515	\$30,000	
130	Piping, Collection Installed	2,000	LF	\$10	\$20,000	
200	TREATMENT SYSTEM					
210	Site Prep/Building	1	ea	\$50,000	\$50,000	
220	UV Oxidation unit, 520 gpm	1	ea	\$200,000	\$200,000	
230	Chemical Storage/Handling	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000	
231	Elec Controls	1	ea	\$30,000	\$30,000	
232	Metering, Influent Piping	1	ea	\$5,000	\$5,000	
240	Effluent Sump	1	ea	\$25,000	\$25,000	
241	Effluent Pump/Piping	1	ea	\$10,000	\$10,000	
300	ON-SITE PIPING FOR WATER DIS	POSAL				
310	10-inch Force Main	1.000	\mathbf{LF}	\$25	\$25,000	
320	Discharge Headwall	-,	ea	\$6,000.00	\$6,000	
320	Discharge mendwarr	-		• •		
	Potimated Decign Cost	7.00%	t of Cor	struction	\$43,138	
	Estimated Design Cost					
	Alternative	6 - Tot	al Capi	ital Costs	\$659,398	
OPERA'	TION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS, AN	NUAL		_		
900	Environmental Technician	500	hrs	\$30.00	\$15,000	
901	UV Svs Engr	200	hrs	\$60.00	\$12,000	
911	Wells Eqt Repairs/replacement	. 8	well	\$1,000	\$8,000	
912	Treat Eqt Repairs/replacement	1	ea	\$12,000	\$12,000	
921	Electrical Costs	200,000	KWH	\$0.08	\$16,000	
923	Hydrogen Peroxide	26.000	lbs/yr	\$0.45	\$11,700	
030	Laboratory Analysis	136	samples	s \$300	\$40,800	
910	Benorting/Record Keening	12	то	\$4,000	\$48,000	
240	Report Ling/Record Rooping				g== <u></u> ==	
	Alternative	e 6 - Tot	tal O &	M Costs	\$163,500	
Not D	recent Value (1993 S) for 10 y	/ears	8.00	& Interest	\$1,626,386	
Net P	10 year cost per 1,000 gallons \$0.595					

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

(

.

. *

.

	ALTERNATIVE 7 COST ES	TIMATE			08/19/93	
On-Site Extraction Air Stripping, Re-injection						
Projec	t: Removal Action for Ground W	ater	-			
riojec	Defense Distribution Region Ce	ntral,	Memphis	Tennessee		
Ttom			-	Unit	Cost	
No	Ttem 0	uantity	Units	Cost	Extension	
CADIT		-				
100	EXTRACTION WELLS					
101	Mohilization	1	LS	\$4,000	\$4,000	
102	Well Drilling. 7 new Wells	720	LF	\$40	\$28,800	
103	Split Spoon Sampling	36	ea	\$20	\$720	
104	6-inch TD St. Steel Casing	450	LF	\$80	\$36,000	
105	6-inch ID St. Steel Screen	270	\mathbf{LF}	\$130	\$35,100	
106	Well Installation	720	LF	\$15	\$10,800	
107	Well development	9	ea	\$3,000	\$27,000	
110	Well Vault/Head completion	10	ea	\$5,000	\$50,000	
111	Motoring/B/flow prev	10	ea	\$1,500	\$15,000	
112	Bining Dumn Discharge	450	LF	\$6	\$2,700	
120	Flee Pump 75 gpm	6	ea	\$1,500	\$9,000	
120	Elec Fomp, 75 gpm Plac Controls	6	ea	\$2,000	\$12,000	
122	Flee Boyer Distribution	1,600	LF	\$15	\$24,000	
122	Diping Collection Installed	1,000	LF	\$10	\$10,000	
130	more events	1,000		,	· -	
200	Cito Drop/Concrete Dad	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000	
210	Jie Frepyconcrece Idd	1	ea	\$68,000	\$68,000	
220	All Stripping lower, 400 gpm	1	ea	\$7,500	\$7,500	
230	Blower ran, doo serm	1	ea	\$20,000	\$20,000	
162	Elec Controls Materian Tafluest Diping	1	ea	\$5,000	\$5,000	
232	Metering, initiation riping	1	ea	\$25,000	\$25,000	
240	Erriuent Sump	1	eð	\$10,000	\$10,000	
241	Effluent Pump/Piping	-	<u>u</u>	*	4 1	
500	OFF-SITE SEWER UPGRADES	1 600	Т. Р	\$25.00	\$40,000	
510	Re-injection header Piping	1,000	LS	\$5,000	\$5,000	
520	Valves/metering	Ŧ	10			
- Vision Deck 7 00% of Construction \$32,593						
	Estimated Design Cost	7.00		301 400100		
	Altornative	7 - Tot	ral Capi	tal Costs	\$498,213	
	Alternative	/ 10	cur cop-		••••	
ODVIDANTON AND MAINTENANCE COSTS AMMILAT.						
OPERA	TION AND MAINIENANCE COSIS, AN	1000	brs	\$30,00	\$30,000	
900	Nelle Est Bonsigg(roplacement	9,001	well	\$1.000	\$8,000	
911	Weils Edt Repairs/replacement	1	ea	\$12,000	\$12,000	
912	Treat Eqt Repairs/replacement	Ā	well	\$2,000	\$8,000	
913	Reinj weils Equ Servicing	60 000	KMH	\$0.08	\$4,800	
921	Electrical Costs	128	samples	s \$300	\$38,400	
930	Laboratory Analysis	12	annbro.	\$4,000	\$48,000	
940	Reporting/Record Reeping	12	що	<i></i>		
	Alternative	7 - To	tal O &	M Costs	\$149,200	
Net D	Present Value (1993 S) for 10 v	ears	8.00	f Interest	\$1,388,294	
10 year cost per 1,000 gallons \$0.734						

÷

APPENDIX F - COST ESTIMATES

METALS TREATMENT COST ESTIMATE 08/19/93

Project: Removal Action for Ground Water Defense Distribution Region Central, Memphis Tennessee Unit Cost Item Quantity Units Cost Extension Item No CAPITAL COSTS 3 \$300,000 \$900,000 Ion Exchange units/media ea 240 \$20,000 1 \$20,000 Piping, Metering for IE Units ea 241 \$80,000 \$80,000 Backwash system/sludge mgt 1 ea 242 \$18,000 \$18,000 1 243 Elec Controls ea. 7.00% of Construction \$71,260 Estimated Design Cost _____ Metals Treatment - Total Capital Costs \$1,089,260 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS, ANNUAL \$22,500 \$30.00 Environmental Technician 750 hrs 900 S400 \$4,800 912 Ion Exchange Repairs 12 mo \$0.08 \$3,200 Electrical Costs 40,000 KWH 921 12 шO \$2,000 \$24,000 Waste Disposal 930 \$250 \$12,000 Laboratory Analysis 48 samples 940 \$36,000 \$3,000 12 mo 950 Reporting/Record Keeping <u>=====</u> \$102,500 Metals treatment - Total O & M Costs 8.00% Interest \$1,645,411 Net Present Value (1993 \$) for 10 years 10 year cost per 1,000 gallons \$0.602

APPENDIX G

•_

سائمو المحادثين

ī

I

U.S. EPA Memorandum

Permits and Permit "Equivalency" Processes for CERCLA On-Site Response Actions. OSWER Directive 9355.7-03

FEB

20 '92 11:17

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

259

FEB 1 9 1992

FROM EPA-HSCD/CRYSTAL STA

38

SOLIO WASTE AND EMERGENCY RESPO

1

OSWER Directive 9355.7-03

• ((.

<u>MEMORANDUM</u>

SUBJECT: Fermits and Permit "Equivalency" Processes for CERCLA On-site Response Actions FROM: Henry L. Longest II, Director Al Office of Emergency and Remedial Response

TO:

Director, Waste Management Division Regions I, IV, V, VII, and VIII Director, Emergency and Remedial Response Division Region II Director, Hazardous Waste Management Division Regions III, VI, and IX Director, Hazardous Waste Division Region X

PURPOSE

The purpose of this directive is to clarify the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) policy with respect to attaining permits for activities at CERCLA sites. CERCLA response actions are exempted by law from the requirement to obtain Federal, State or local permits related to any activities conducted completely on-site. It is our policy to assure all activities conducted on sites are protective of human health and the environment. It is not Agency policy to allow surrogate or permit equivalency procedures to impact the progress or cost of CERCLA site remediation in any respect.

BACKGROUND

In implementing remedial actions, EFA has consistently taken the position that the acquisition of permits is not required for on-site remedial actions. However, this does not remove the requirement to meet (or vaive) the substantive provisions of permitting regulations that are applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs). (For further discussion on ARARs in general, see the attachment to this directive. For definitions of "substantive" and "administrative," see 55 FR 8756-57 and the CERCIA Compliance with other Laws Manual, Part I, pages 1-11-12.) The proposed and final 1982 National Oil and

ς.

.....

38 260

- 2 -

Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) made no mention of the parmit issue. However, EPA addressed the issue in a memorandum antitled "CERCLA Compliance with Other Environmental Statutes" which was attached as an appendix to the proposed 1985 NCP (50 FR 5928, February 12, 1985). The memorandum stated:

> "CERCLA procedural and administrative requirements will be modified to provide safeguards similar to those provided under other laws. Application for and receipt of permits is not required for on-site response actions taken under the Fund-financed or enforcement authorities of CERCLA."

EPA determined in the final rule [1985 NCP section 300.68(a)(3)] that "Federal, State, and local permits are not required for Fund-financed action or remedial actions taken pursuant to Federal action under section 106 of CERCLA." The 1986 amendments to CERCLA codified section 300.68(a)(3) of the 1985 NCP with a statutory provision, section 121(e)(1). CERCLA section 121(e)(1) provides that no Federal, State, or local permit shall be required for the portion of any removal or remedial action conducted entirely <u>on-site</u>, where such remedial action is selected and carried out in compliance with section 121.

The 1990 NCP (section 300.400(e)(1)) implements this permit exemption for "on-site" actions, defining "on-site" as "the areal extent of contamination and all suitable areas in very close proximity to the contamination necessary for implementation of the response action." The preamble to the NCP (at 55 FR 8689, March 8, 1990) explains that "areal" refers both to the surface areas and the air above the site. EPA policy further defines "on-site" to include the 'soil and the groundwater plume that are to be remediated. On-site remedial actions may involve limited areas of noncontaminated land; for instance, an on-site treatment plant may need to be located above the plume or simply outside of the waste area itself.

As provided in NCP section 300.400(e)(1), response actions covered by CERCLA section 121(e)(1) include those conducted pursuant to CERCLA sections 104, 106, 120, 121, and 122. Thus response actions conducted by a lead agency, or by a potentially responsible party or other person under an order or consent decree with EPA, are covered under the ambit of CERCLA section 121(e)(1). Response actions by a lead agency include those response actions implemented by EPA, the Coast Guard, or another Federal agency. They also include response actions implemented by a State or political subdivision operating pursuant to a contract or cooperative agreement executed pursuant to CERCLA

section 104(d)(1), under which EPA selects (or must approve) the remedy. Hereafter, the discussion concerning lead agencies should be understood to include, where appropriate, potentially responsible parties or other persons acting under CERCLA section 106.

DISCUSSION

While permits may not be required for CERCLA on-site response actions, some permitting authorities have attempted to require lead agency participation in a process that is "equivalent" to a permitting process in order to satisfy the authority's concern that there will be compliance with ARARS. In effect, they argue that participation in a permit-like process is necessary to identify the substantive provisions of permitting regulations.

Under a permit "equivalency" process, the lead agency is asked to participate in a process that an applicant would pursue to secure a permit, except that most fees and public hearing requirements are normally waived. The permit "equivalency" process itself has caused delay and cost increases in some response actions. The process holds the potential for further delays and cost increases due to often lengthy review of documents submitted to the permitting authority as if a permit were actually required, and due to the attachment of non-ARAR conditions by the permitting authority to the permit. "ecuivalency." It also suggests, incorrectly, that the approval of a permitting authority is required before a CERCLA action may proceed or before an ARARs determination may be made with respect to the permitting regulations.

Unfortunately, some Twad agencies have acquiesced to participation in such "equivalency" processes. Such acquiescence has been rationalized by the fact that it is particularly difficult to determine compliance with the substantive requirements of permitting programs, where levels are set on a site-specific basis, e.g., such as based upon the equipment provided by the remedial action contractor, or as would normally be set in a permit or in the Record of Decision (ROD) at Superfund sites. In some cases, lead agencies have agreed to participate in a permit "equivalency" process, although both the lead agency and the permitting authority have acknowledged the applicability of CERCLA section 121(e)(1).

EPA has consistently rejected the notion that CERCLA response actions are subject to such processes (see Background discussion above). The NCP, while acknowledging the need for coordination and consultation with other agencies, notes (at 55

- 4 -

FR 8756-7, March 8, 1990) that CERCLA section 121(e))(1) and other CERCLA provisions:

"...reflect Congress' judgment that CERCLA actions should not be delayed by time-consuming and duplicative administrative requirements such as permitting, although remedies should achieve the substantive standards of applicable or relevant and appropriate laws... EPA's approach is wholly consistent with the overall goal of the Superfund program, to achieve expeditious cleanups, and reflects an understanding of the uniqueness of the CERCLA program, which impacts more than one medium (and thus overlaps with a number of other regulatory and statutory programs). Accordingly, it would be inappropriate to subject CERCLA response actions to the multitude of administrative requirements of other Federal and State offices and agencies.

At the same time, EPA recognizes the benefits of consultation, reporting, etc. To some degree, these functions are accomplished through the State involvement and public participation requirements in the NCP. In addition, EPA has already strongly recommended that its Regional offices (and States when they are the lead agency) establish procedures, protocols or memoranda of understanding that, while not recreating the administrative and procedural aspects of a permit, will ensure early and continuous consultation and coordination with other EPA programs and other agencies. CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual, [Part I], OSWER Directive No. 9234.1-01 (August 8, 1988). In working with States, EPA generally will coordinate and consult with the State Superfund office. That State Superfund office should distribute to or obtain necessary information from other State offices interested in activities at Superfund sites.

The basis for this recommendation is a recognition that such coordination and consultation is often useful to determine how substantive requirements implemented under other EPA programs and by other agencies should be applied to a Superfund action. For example, although the Superfund office will make the final decision on using ARARS, a water office may provide information helpful in determining ARARS when a surface water discharge is part of the Superfund remedy.

EPA also recognizes the importance of providing information to other programs and agencies that maintain environmental data bases. This is particularly true where the remedy includes releases of substances into the air or water and

the extent of such releases is integral for air and water programs to maintain accurate information on ambient air and surface water quality in order to set statutorily-specified standards."

IMPLEMENTATION

There are several possible ways to alleviate the delays and cost increases caused by a permit "equivalency" process. First, lead agencies can refuse to participate in this process, based on the fact that actual permits are not required under CERCLA section 121(e)(1), and procedural requirements are not ARARS under CERCLA section 121(d)(2) and the NCP.

Alternatively, and preferably, the lead agency could actively consult on a regular and frequent basis with the permitting authority, in situations where the lead agency deems it helpful to hasten ARARs identification. To facilitate such consultation, the lead agency should provide copies of the submittals of the design contractor and remedial action contractor in a timely manner to the permitting authority whose ARARs are the subject of the submittals. The NCP preamble explains (at 55 FR 8757, March 8, 1990) that if EPA is the lead agency, the coordination and consultation with State permitting authorities will generally be conducted through a single State office. Support Agency Cooperative Agreements, Superfund Memoranda of Agreement, or other protocols may be appropriate vehicles to establish specific time limits for the permitting authority to provide technical assistance in the evaluation of site-specific ARARs.

However, any such agreement should be based on the understanding that a procedural "permit" or permit equivalency approval is <u>not</u> required, but that the lead agency is participating in the process in order to facilitate coordination and consultation with the permitting authority. In some instances, because of the need to complete a response action and to avoid delays and cost increases, the lead agency may decide to terminate the consultation process. Nevertheless, this process should result in the lead agency's designing the remedy to meet all of the substantive requirements of the permitting regulations that are ARARS.

NOTE: The above policies and procedures are intended solely as guidance to EPA employees. They do not constitute rulemaking by the Agency, and may not be relied on to create a right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any other person. EPA may take action that is at variance with the policies and procedures in this directive.

Attachment 👘 🖓

Discussion on ARARs

CERCLA section 121(d)(2)(A) and NCP section 300.430(f)(1)(i)(A) require EPA to select remedies that meet or waive certain Federal or State ARARS. ARARS are defined in the NCP at section 300.5 under the rubrics of "applicable requirements" and "relevant and appropriate requirements." For guidance on ARARS identification, see NCP sections 300.400(g); 300.430(e)(2); 300.515(d)(1) and (3) and (h)(2); CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual, Parts I and II, OSWER Directives No. 9234.1-01 and -02 (August 8, 1988 and August 1989). The NCP does not require the concurrence of States or other Federal agencies (or other EPA program offices) on the Superfund Program's determination as to which standards are ARARS, although consultation with the appropriate State or Federal agency is required.

NCP section 300.435(b)(2) provides that once ARARs are selected, it becomes the responsibility of the lead agency during the Remedial Design (RD) and Remedial Action (RA) to ensure that all Federal and State ARARs identified in the ROD are met. In accordance with CERCLA section 121(d)(4) and NCP section 300.430(f)(1)(ii)(C), EPA may select a remedial action that does not meet an ARAR under any one of 6 waiver circumstances. If waivers from any ARARs are involved, the lead agency is responsible for ensuring that the conditions of the waivers are met. Pursuant to CERCLA section 121(f)(1), States must be provided an opportunity to comment on proposed ARARs waivers and may challenge ARARs waivers, as provided in CERCLA section 121(f)(2) and (3).

Remedial actions must comply with those requirements that are determined to be ARARS at the time of ROD signature. NCP section 300.430(f)(l)(ii)(B), in effect, "freezes" ARARs when the ROD is signed unless compliance with newly promulgated or modified requirements is necessary to ensure the protectiveness of the remedy. If ARARs were not frozen at this point, promulgation of a new or modified requirement could result in a reconsideration of the remedy and a restart of the lengthy design process, even if protectiveness were not compromised. This lack of certainty would adversely affect the operation of the CERCLA program, would be inconsistent with Congress' mandate to expeditiously clean up sites, and could adversely affect negotiations with potentially responsible parties.

As a general policy, EPA considers newly-promulgated requirements or other information as part of the review conducted

at least every five years, under CERCLA section 121(c), for sites where hazardous substances remain on-site. The review requires EPA to assure that human health and the environment are being protected by the remedial action. Hence, the remedy should be examined in light of any new standards that would be applicable or relevant and appropriate to the circumstances at the site and the remedy is still protective. However, if such information comes to light at times other than at the five-year reviews, EPA will consider the necessity of acting to modify the remedy at

After the ROD is signed, new information may be generated during the RD/RA process that could affect the remedy selected in the ROD. Such new information may result in "nonsignificant," "significant," or "fundamental" changes to the remedy. Nonsignificant changes are minor changes that usually arise during design and construction, when modifications are made to the functional specifications of the remedy to optimize performance and minimize cost. This may result in minor changes to the type and/or cost of materials, equipment, facilities, services and supplies used to implement the remedy. agency need not prepare an explanation of significant differences for minor changes. These changes should be documented in the post-ROD file, such as the RD/RA case file. Significant changes to a remedy are generally incremental changes to a component of a remedy that do not fundamentally alter the overall remedial approach. The lead agency would need to publish in the Federal Register an explanation of significant differences announcing such changes. On the other hand, if the action, decree, or settlement fundamentally alters the ROD in such manner that the proposed action, with respect to scope, performance, or cost, is no longer reflective of the selected remedy in the ROD, the lead agency will publish in the Federal Register a proposed amendment to the ROD. Proposed ROD amendments should identify new requirements that are ARARs and whether they will be met or

For more guidance on responding to post-ROD information, see "ARARS Q's & A's: General Policy, RCRA, CWA, SDWA, Post-ROD information, and Contingent Waivers," Publication No. 9234.2-01/FS-A (June 1991), Questions 14-16. İ

- 7 -



