



[www.epa.gov/superfund/
community/tasc](http://www.epa.gov/superfund/community/tasc)

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES FOR COMMUNITIES Quanta Resources Corporation, Edgewater, NJ

Quanta Resources Proposed Plan, Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study November 4 & 9, 2010

This factsheet is a resource for communities living adjacent to or near the Quanta Resources Superfund site and is provided by EPA's Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) program, which is implemented by independent technical and environmental consultants. This document highlights the areas of concern raised by the community about the site's Remedial Investigation (RI), Feasibility Study (FS) and Proposed Plan as well as provides comments on these issues. More information about the site can be found at:

<http://www.epa.gov/region2/superfund/npl/quanta/>

Introduction

Ground water below the Quanta Superfund site and adjacent properties is contaminated with arsenic, chromium, lead, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), non-aqueous phase liquid (NAPL) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Soils at the site are contaminated with NAPL, arsenic, chromium, lead, and PAHs. EPA's Proposed Plan was released in July 2010 and recommends a method for cleaning up the site, weighing the method against other options. The cleanup method selected was Alternative 4a: NAPL and Arsenic In-Situ Solidification/Stabilization (ISS), Hydraulic Containment of High Concentration Arsenic Area (HCAA), Preserving 115 River Road Buildings (with Ground water Alternative G3). The public may provide comments on the Proposed Plan until November 17, 2010. The Community Advisory Group of Edgewater (QCAGE) asked for assistance in understanding the issues highlighted below. According to EPA guidelines and practice, all the methods in the final clean up must be tested and demonstrated effective prior to use.

Issue: Are capping and institutional controls viable options for cleanup?

Comment: The Proposed Plan uses capping and institutional controls as component of all the possible alternatives. To prevent human and ecological risk exposure, soil capping requires indefinite, long-term

Interested in Giving Your Opinion?



Public comments on the Proposed Plan can be delivered as follows by Wednesday, November 17, 2010:

By e-mail: ho.richard@epa.gov

By mail: Richard Ho
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. EPA
290 Broadway
19th Floor
New York, NY 1000-1866

maintenance and institutional controls. Maintenance ensures that the operation of the caps and institutional controls restrict future construction and land use.

Issue: Is excavation a viable option?

Comment: Excavation, or soil removal, generally, is often the most permanent solution and does not need long-term upkeep and maintenance or require institutional controls. Some contaminants may be so deep that effective removal is not possible, however. Other site conditions affect the ability to excavate soils.

Issue: Are the cleanup remedies permanent?

Comment: Some methods are known to be permanent. The long term effectiveness of ISS is less certain for the NAPL contaminants than for arsenic at Quanta. The cement “monoliths” created by ISS may experience weathering from conditions such as acid rain.

Issue: The cross-sectional diagrams used in the FS are confusing.

Comment: The data used to create the cross-sections came from soil samples, wells and a modern technique using lasers. The system has various degrees of effectiveness in estimating different forms of NAPLs. The cross-sectional images are explained further in the longer technical summary and will be discussed at the November 4 and 9, 2010 QCAGE meetings.

Issue: How effective is In-Situ Solidification/Stabilization (ISS)?

Comment: ISS has been most commonly used for inorganic contaminants, such as metals, but less for the organic contaminants found at this site. The materials used in the ISS process would have to be tested on the specific combination of contaminants at Quanta to ensure the effectiveness.

Issue: How effective are subaqueous reactive barriers (SRB)?

Comment: SRBs, also called reactive barriers, have had mixed results at other sites, including reduced absorption of arsenic and NAPLs.

Issue: Do the contaminants interact?

Comment: The presence of NAPL has been shown to increase the arsenic levels in ground water, even if there are no known and described direct chemical reactions between arsenic and the organic chemicals. Removing NAPL may not have predictable outcomes for arsenic levels in ground water in untreated areas.

Information developed by TASC for this site
will be posted for public viewing at:
<http://estewards.com/>