

N61414.AR.001706  
NAB LITTLE CREEK  
5090.3a

FINAL ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR SOILD WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT 7B (SWMU 7B)  
SMALL BOATS SANDBLAST YARD JEB LITTLE CREEK VA  
1/1/2013  
CH2MHILL

Final

**Action Memorandum  
for Solid Waste Management Unit 7b  
Small Boats Sandblast Yard**

**Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia**

**Contract Task Order WE32**

**January 2013**

Prepared for

**Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Mid-Atlantic**

Under the

**CLEAN 1000 Program  
Contract N62470-08-D-1000**

Prepared by



**CH2MHILL**

**Virginia Beach, Virginia**

**DECLARATION**

**ACTION MEMORANDUM**

**Solid Waste Management Unit 7b – Small Boats Sandblast Yard  
Sediment Removal**


**Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia**

**DATE:** January 22, 2013  
**SUBJECT:** Removal Action at Solid Waste Management Unit 7b – Small Boat Sandblast Yard, Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia  
**FROM:** Commander, Mid-Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
**TO:** C.L. Stuppard  
Captain, U.S. Navy

This Action Memorandum documents approval for dredging and offsite disposal of sediment at Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 7b, Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia. This Action Memorandum serves as the Decision Document for selection of the Non-Time Critical Removal Action as evaluated in the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for SWMU 7b, prepared under separate cover and developed in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, and is consistent with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan. This decision is based on the administrative record for the site. It is expected that the removal action will mitigate all risks at SWMU 7b and no further action will be required for the site, to be documented in a forthcoming Proposed Plan and Record of Decision.

Conditions at SWMU 7b meet the NCP Section 300.415(b)(2) criteria for removal. Naval Facilities Engineering Command Mid-Atlantic recommends approval of the proposed removal action. The total project ceiling if approved will be \$1,910,400. Response actions should commence as soon as practical to expedite the removal of sediment at the site.

Approved By:



C. L. Stuppard  
Captain, U.S. Navy  
Commander, Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia



Date

# Contents

---

<b>I.</b>	<b>Purpose .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Site Conditions and Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A.	Site Description .....	1
1.	Removal Site Evaluation .....	2
2.	Physical Location .....	2
3.	Site Characteristics .....	3
4.	Release or Threatened Release into the Environment of a Hazardous Substance, Pollutant, or Contaminant .....	3
5.	National Priorities List Status .....	3
6.	Maps, Pictures, and Other Graphic Presentations .....	3
B.	Other Actions .....	3
1.	Previous Actions .....	3
2.	Current Actions .....	3
C.	State and Local Authority's Role .....	3
1.	State and Local Actions to Date .....	3
2.	Potential for Continued State and Local Response .....	4
<b>III.</b>	<b>Threats to Public Health, Welfare or the Environment, and Statutory and Regulatory Authorities.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Endangerment Determination.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Proposed Actions and Estimated Cost .....</b>	<b>4</b>
A.	Proposed Actions .....	4
1.	Proposed Action Description .....	4
2.	Contribution to Remedial Performance.....	5
3.	Description of Alternative Technologies .....	5
4.	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements .....	5
5.	Project Schedule.....	6
B.	Estimated Costs.....	6
1.	Response Action Contract .....	6
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Expected Change in the Situation Should Action Be Delayed or Not Taken .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Outstanding Policy Issues.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Enforcement .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Recommendation.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>7</b>

## Tables

- 1 SWMU 7b – Small Boats Sandblast Yard Cost Estimate – Alternative 2

## Figures

- 1 SWMU 7 Location Map  
2 SWMU 7 Boundary and Immediate Vicinity  
3 Removal Action Area

**Attachments**

- A Final EE/CA for SWMU 7b – Small Boats Sandblast Yard
- B Public Notice and Responsiveness Summary

# Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

ABM	abrasive blast material
ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
DoD	Department of Defense
EE/CA	Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
ER	environmental restoration
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
IR	installation restoration
JEB	Joint Expeditionary Base
MILCON	military construction
NAB	Naval Amphibious Base
Navy	Department of the Navy
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan
NFA	No Further Action
NPL	National Priorities List
NTCRA	Non-Time Critical Removal Action
RI	Remedial Investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SI	Site Investigation
SWMU	Solid Waste Management Unit
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
VDEQ	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality

# I. Purpose

This Action Memorandum documents approval for a Non-Time Critical Removal Action (NTCRA) to address sediment at Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 7b, Joint Expeditionary Base (JEB) Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia. The Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), included as **Attachment A**, focused on addressing metals in sediment that are the result of historic site activities. It is expected that the removal action will mitigate all risk associated with exposure to sediment at SWMU 7b and no further action will be required for the site, to be documented in a forthcoming Proposed Plan and Record of Decision (ROD). This Action Memorandum serves as the Decision Document for the selection of the NTCRA, as evaluated in the EE/CA, and to authorize the Department of the Navy (Navy) to conduct the work proposed therein. The alternatives evaluated in the EE/CA are summarized as follows:

- Alternative #1—No action
- Alternative #2— Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill
- Alternative #3— Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill
- Alternative #4— Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill

This Action Memorandum was completed in accordance with the remedial program requirements defined by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) as amended, the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), and United States Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) *Guidance on Conducting Non-Time Critical Removal Actions Under CERCLA* (USEPA, 1993).

The Navy has broad authority under CERCLA Section 104 and Executive Order 12580 to carry out removal actions when the release is on, or the sole source of the release is from, a Navy Installation. The Navy and Marine Corps Installation Restoration (IR) Program was initiated to identify, assess, characterize, and cleanup or control contamination from past hazardous waste disposal operations and hazardous material spills at Navy and Marine Corps activities. This Action Memorandum follows the guidelines published in the *Navy Environmental Restoration Program Manual* (NAVFAC, 2006) and the *Superfund Removal Guidance for Preparing Action Memoranda* (USEPA, 2009).

# II. Site Conditions and Background

On October 1, 2009, Hampton Roads' first Department of Defense (DoD) Joint Base was established. This new installation comprises the former Naval Amphibious Base (NAB) Little Creek and the former Army Post Fort Story; the new name is JEB Little Creek-Fort Story. With the formation of this new command, the Navy assumes responsibility for management of both properties and will now merge public meetings regarding the ongoing environmental restoration (ER) programs. However, separate records will be maintained to ensure the integrity of ongoing efforts at both properties. When required for public notices and distributions, the former bases are identified jointly as JEB Little Creek-Fort Story. For ER Program documents, the bases are referred to separately as JEB Little Creek or JEB Fort Story. The former NAB Little Creek was placed on the USEPA National Priorities List (NPL) May 10, 1999 (USEPA ID: VA5170022482).

## A. Site Description

The former NAB Little Creek began operations as a permanent base in 1946. The base's mission was the training of landing craft personnel for operational assignments. JEB Little Creek has expanded in both area and complexity of its mission over the past 65 years. Base personnel provide logistic facilities and support services for local commands, organizations, home-ported ships, and other U.S. and allied units to meet amphibious warfare-training requirements of the U.S. armed forces. Past and present operations at JEB Little Creek include vehicle and boat maintenance, boat painting and sandblasting, construction and repair of buildings and piers, mixing and

application of pesticides, electroplating of musical instruments, laundry and dry cleaning, medical and dental treatment, and the generation of steam for heat. Land development surrounding the base is residential, commercial, and industrial.

SWMU 7, the Small Boats Sandblast Yard, is located at the intersection of Intercove Road and Signal Point Road in the north-central portion of the Base (**Figure 1**). The ground surface at SWMU 7 is covered primarily with buildings, concrete, asphalt, and hard-packed gravel (**Figure 2**). Precipitation runs off to Desert Cove or is discharged through one of 22 outfalls surrounding the cove with very little infiltration to groundwater. Eight of the 22 outfalls are defined as regulated stormwater and three as regulated process water outfalls under the current Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit, VA0079928. The remaining 11 outfalls are non-regulated stormwater outfalls. Almost the entire shoreline of SWMU 7 is bulk headed and currently used to moor small ships. Desert Cove is a tidal marine environment connected to the Chesapeake Bay via the Connector and Little Creek Channels. All drainage to the cove is from on-Base areas, consisting mainly of buildings and asphalt parking areas. In 2008, a military construction (MILCON) action was completed to demolish and replace Piers 44 through 51, construct a new quaywall along the eastern and southern edges of the cove, and dredge limited areas surrounding the former piers. SWMU 7 is actively used by the facility for heavy equipment storage, small ship mooring, ship maintenance (i.e., sandblasting in Building CB-125), and training. Recreational swimming, fishing, and crabbing are not permitted in Desert Cove.

## 1. Removal Site Evaluation

SWMU 7 was used to sandblast and paint ships until 1996, when sandblasting activities were moved to an indoor sandblasting facility in building CB-125. Approximately 4,000 yd<sup>3</sup> of spent abrasive blast material (ABM) generated between 1960 and 1982 were stored in open piles in the construction footprint of building CB-125 and in the area of buildings CB-317 and CB-318. No release controls were identified at SWMU 7; therefore, spent ABM was historically released to soils and Desert Cove.

SWMU 7 has been characterized under several investigations and studies between 1989 and 2012. For investigation purposes, SWMU 7 was subdivided by media. The terrestrial portion of the site (SWMU 7a) is composed of soil and groundwater, while the aquatic portion of the site (SWMU 7b) is composed of sediment and surface water. Following an Interim Removal action in September 2004 to address lead-contaminated soils, the Navy, in partnership with the USEPA and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ), agreed that no further action was required for SWMU 7a, and a ROD was signed in June 2005 (Navy, 2005).

The complete summary of the previous investigations at SWMU 7b, along with figures showing the sediment sample locations and conceptual site model, are presented in the EE/CA provided as **Attachment A**. Because of the tidal nature of the water body and the presence of 22 outfalls (11 non-regulated stormwater, 8 regulated stormwater, and 3 regulated process water) surrounding the cove, surface water samples were not collected as part of investigation activities, as it could not be determined if detected contaminants were from SWMU 7 or non-site-related sources. The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) did not identify any potentially unacceptable risks to human health from exposure to sediment. The Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) and Post-MILCON Action Evaluation identified potentially unacceptable ecological risks to lower-trophic-level receptors from exposure to copper, lead, mercury, and zinc in sediment.

## 2. Physical Location

JEB Little Creek consists of approximately 2,215 acres in the northwest portion of Virginia Beach, Virginia, adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay (**Figure 1**). The facility centers around four saltwater bodies: Little Creek Harbor, Little Creek Cove, Desert Cove, and Little Creek Channel, the latter of which connects the coves and harbor with the Chesapeake Bay. Several freshwater lakes (Chubb Lake, Lake Bradford, Little Creek Reservoir/Lake Smith, and Lake Whitehurst) are also located on or adjacent to the facility. SWMU 7 is a 53-acre area located at the intersection of Intercove Road and Signal Point Road in the north-central portion of the Base (**Figure 2**).

### 3. Site Characteristics

SWMU 7b was historically used to sandblast and paint ships until 1996, when sandblasting activities were moved to an indoor facility (CB-125). SWMU 7b consists of Desert Cove and the Connector Channel. Desert Cove is a tidal marine environment connected to the Chesapeake Bay via the Connector and Little Creek Channels. Almost the entire shoreline of SWMU 7b is bulk-headed and currently used to moor small ships. Twenty-two outfalls discharge stormwater and process water runoff to Desert Cove from various locations within the facility consisting mainly of buildings and asphalt parking areas. Recreational swimming, fishing, and crabbing are not permitted in Desert Cove.

### 4. Release or Threatened Release into the Environment of a Hazardous Substance, Pollutant, or Contaminant

Based on the data and results of the Site Investigation (SI) (CH2M HILL, 2001), Remedial Investigation, (RI) (CH2M HILL, 2004), and Post-MILCON Action Evaluation (CH2M HILL, 2012), it was determined that there are potentially unacceptable risks to lower-trophic-level ecological receptors from exposure to metals (copper, lead, mercury, and zinc) in sediment, resulting from historic releases of spent ABM at SWMU 7. Because of the tidal nature of the water body and 22 outfalls surrounding the cove, any contamination detected in the surface water of the cove may or may not be associated with SWMU 7; therefore, surface water was not evaluated in the HHRA and ERA.

### 5. National Priorities List Status

The former NAB Little Creek was placed on the NPL on May 10, 1999. SWMU 7b is among the IR sites being addressed under CERCLA at JEB Little Creek.

### 6. Maps, Pictures, and Other Graphic Presentations

Several figures are included in the Action Memorandum that provide graphical representations of SWMU 7b and the planned removal action. These include:

- **Figure 1** - SWMU 7 Location Map
- **Figure 2** - SWMU 7 Boundary and Immediate Vicinity
- **Figure 3** - Removal Action Area

Additional figures included as part of the EE/CA (**Attachment A**) include:

- **Figure 2-3** - Previous Sample Locations
- **Figure 2-4** - Conceptual Site Model
- **Figure 2-5** – Preliminary Remediation Area

## B. Other Actions

### 1. Previous Actions

No previous actions have been completed for SWMU 7b.

### 2. Current Actions

No current actions are being completed for SWMU 7b.

## C. State and Local Authorities Role

### 1. State and Local Actions to Date

Under Executive Order 12580, the President delegates authority to undertake CERCLA response actions to the DoD. Congress further outlined this authority in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program Amendments, under 10 United States Code Sections 2701 through 2705. CERCLA Section 120 requires the Navy to apply state removal and remedial action law requirements at its facilities.

## 2. Potential for Continued State and Local Response

The Navy will continue to be the lead agency, and the Navy's ER Program will continue to be the exclusive source of funding for remedial actions on JEB Little Creek property. As members of the JEB Little Creek Tier I Partnering Team, the USEPA and VDEQ, through their respective roles as lead and support regulatory agencies, will continue to be consulted until actions addressing the contaminated area are complete. VDEQ will continue to be the state agency responsible for administration and enforcement of environmental regulations for Navy ER Program sites on JEB Little Creek property.

## III. Threats to Public Health, Welfare or the Environment, and Statutory and Regulatory Authorities

Section 300.415 of the NCP lists the factors to be considered in determining the appropriateness of a NTCRA. Paragraphs (b)(2)(i) of Section 300.415 apply to the conditions as follows:

**300.415(b)(2)(i)** "Actual or potential exposures to nearby human populations, animals, or the food chain from hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants."

Based on the data and results of the SI, RI, and Post-MILCON Action Evaluation, it was determined that metals (copper, lead, mercury, and zinc) are present in sediment at concentrations that pose potentially unacceptable ecological risks to lower-trophic-level receptors (benthic macro invertebrates). No potentially unacceptable human health risk from exposure to sediment was identified. Because of the tidal nature of the water body and 22 outfalls surrounding the cove, any contamination detected in the surface water of the cove may or may not be associated with SWMU 7; therefore, surface water was not evaluated in the HHRA and ERA.

## IV. Endangerment Determination

Actual or threatened releases of pollutants and contaminants from SWMU 7b sediment, if not addressed by implementing the response action discussed in this Action Memorandum, may present an endangerment to lower-trophic-level receptors (benthic macro invertebrates).

## V. Proposed Actions and Estimated Cost

### A. Proposed Actions

The scope of the removal action to be initiated at SWMU 7b includes removal of sediment from the preliminary removal action area identified in **Figure 3**. Based on the results of pre-delineation sediment sampling, additional removal may be required in those grids proposed for risk management. Upon completion of the removal action, potential risk from ecological receptor exposure to sediment will be mitigated and NFA for sediment and surface water at SWMU 7b will be documented in a Proposed Plan and ROD.

#### 1. Proposed Action Description

The preferred removal action alternative for sediment at SWMU 7b, as presented in the EE/CA (**Attachment A**), is Alternative 2 which consists of the removal of approximately 4,300 cy of impacted sediment via mechanical dredging and upland disposal, followed by replacement with clean fill. Alternative 2 is protective of human health and the environment; consistent with the scope of the planned MILCON maintenance dredge and SWMU 3 NTCRA; and is not significantly more expensive than the other alternatives that were evaluated in the EE/CA. Alternative 2 includes pre-delineation sampling, mobilization, dredging, dewatering, barge decontamination, site restoration and short-term monitoring, as summarized below and detailed in the EE/CA (**Attachment A**).

Prior to completion of the work planning phase, pre-delineation subsurface sediment sampling will be conducted to determine the required final dredging depths. Prior to removal (dredging) activities, utility locating will be

performed to identify utilities that may impact the removal action. The same dredging subcontractor that will be performing the MILCON maintenance dredging and SWMU 3 dredging will be performing this removal action. A pre-removal bathymetric survey will be completed, followed by a debris sweep, if any large debris is identified.

Dredging will be completed using a mechanical dredge with a clamshell bucket designed for environmental applications. The dredge will be positioned on a barge and will operate within an area contained within silt curtains and oil booms. Dredged sediment will be loaded onto water-tight scows where it will undergo passive dewatering. The dredged material will sit in the scow for a period of time to allow the solids to settle to the bottom of the scow. The overlying water will then be pumped through a filtration system located on the scow and discharged to Desert Cove within the area contained within silt curtains and oil booms. Intermediate bathymetric surveys and a post-removal bathymetric survey will be completed to confirm that contract dredging depths were achieved. Following completion of the post-removal bathymetric survey, the site will be restored through placement of a clean sand layer. A minimum of six inches of clean sand will be placed across the dredged area; however, enough sand will be placed to re-establish the cove floor elevation to -10.92 feet below mean lower low water (-10 feet JEB Little Creek Station Vertical Datum). Sand placement will be verified by collecting sediment cores allowing for visual confirmation of thickness. Following completion of sand placement, a bathymetric survey of the area will be completed to confirm re-establishment of the cove floor to the specified elevation and determine final site conditions.

Prior to transporting sediment offsite, waste characterization sampling will be conducted. Following completion of all dredging and offsite disposal of sediment, each scow will be decontaminated and decontamination fluids will be containerized for waste characterization. All dredged sediment and decontamination fluids will be transported to a CERCLA-approved facility for disposal.

Short-term monitoring will be required during the construction phase to protect human health and the environment. Monitoring requirements may include turbidity and water quality monitoring and noise monitoring. Monitoring requirements will be defined during the work planning phase.

## **2. Contribution to Remedial Performance**

This NTCRA will mitigate potentially unacceptable risks from exposure to sediment within the SWMU 7b removal action area through removal of metals contaminated sediment. Dredging will be deemed complete when the lateral and vertical extent of removal, to be defined following additional pre-NTCRA remediation area delineation sediment sampling, has been achieved and the prescribed thickness of sand has been placed. As a result, confirmation samples are not required upon completion of NTCRA activities. Upon completion of the removal action, potential risk from ecological receptor exposure to sediment will be mitigated and NFA for sediment and surface water at SWMU 7b will be documented in a Proposed Plan and ROD.

## **3. Description of Alternative Technologies**

Four alternatives were assessed for addressing sediment at SWMU 7b in the EE/CA. These alternatives were evaluated and compared based upon their effectiveness, implementability, and cost. The EE/CA (**Attachment A**) describes the considered alternatives in greater detail, as well as the process by which the alternatives were evaluated, compared, and selected.

## **4. Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements**

The NCP requires that removal actions attain federal and state Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) with limited exception, to the extent practicable. Analysis of the removal action alternatives for SWMU 7b sediment with respect to the applicable ARARs is presented in the EE/CA (**Attachment A**). The removal action set forth in this Action Memorandum will comply with ARARs to the extent practicable.

## 5. Project Schedule

The public notice of availability for the EE/CA was published December 13, 2012, and the EE/CA was made available for public review and comments from December 13, 2012 through January 13, 2012. The public notice and responsiveness summary are included as **Attachment B**. No public comments were received.

The proposed project schedule for the consecutive activities associated with the removal action is:

- EE/CA Public Comment Period – 30 days
- Subcontracting, Work Plan, and Mobilization—3 months
- Removal Action—1 month
- CERCLA Documentation—4 months

## B. Estimated Costs

The NCP 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 300.415 dictates statutory limits of \$2 million and 12 months for USEPA fund-financed removal actions, with statutory exemption for emergencies and actions consistent with the removal action to be taken. This removal action will not be USEPA fund-financed. The Navy ER Program does not limit the cost or duration of the removal action (Navy, 2006).

### 1. Response Action Contract

The Navy will contract with environmental remediation contractors to perform the required work associated with the SWMU 7b removal action. The estimated costs are itemized in **Table 1**. Detailed cost estimates are provided in the EE/CA (**Attachment A**). The estimated costs are provided to an accuracy of +50 percent and -30 percent.

TABLE 1

SWMU 3-Pier 10 Sandblast Yard Removal Action Cost – Alternative 2

<b>Pre-Dredge Sampling</b>	
In-Situ Waste Characterization Sampling	\$29,200
<b>Site Preparation</b>	
Dredging Preparation	\$22,900
<b>Dredging and Disposal</b>	
Dredging	\$128,700
Scow Free Water Removal	\$51,600
Sediment Transportation and Disposal	\$496,800
Decontamination Water Transportation and Disposal*	\$0
<b>Site Restoration/Demobilization</b>	
Sand Layer Placement	\$127,800
Final Site Survey	\$4,025
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$861,100</b>
Contingency (15%)	\$129,200
General Conditions (10%)	\$86,100
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,076,400</b>
Performance Bond (2%)	\$21,500
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,097,900</b>
Design Cost (8%)	\$87,800
Construction Oversight (8%)	\$87,800
<b>Total Capital Cost of Alternative 2</b>	<b>\$1,273,600</b>
-30%	\$891,600
+50%	\$1,910,400

Notes:

Cost estimate prepared using costs from recent similar projects, Navy CLEAN laboratory BOA rates, and quotes from Port Weanack, Waste Management, and Summit Environmental.

\*Assumes seamless dredging operation from SWMU 3 to SWMU 7b.

## VI. Expected Change in the Situation Should Action Be Delayed or Not Taken

If no action is taken or the action is delayed, potentially unacceptable risks to the environment will remain. The proposed action is consistent with planned MILCON maintenance dredging and the SWMU 3 NTCRA, which consist of mechanical dredging via an environmental clamshell bucket, upland disposal via scow, and sand placement (SWMU 3 NTCRA only). Therefore, completion of the SWMU 7b action in conjunction with these planned activities will result in cost savings for mobilization of dredge equipment and equipment decontamination. If the removal action were delayed, overall site remedy costs may increase. Upon completion of the removal action, potential risk from ecological receptor exposure to sediment will be mitigated and NFA for sediment and surface water at SWMU 7b will be documented in a Proposed Plan and ROD.

## VII. Outstanding Policy Issues

There are no outstanding policy issues regarding this action.

## VIII. Enforcement

The Navy can and will perform the proposed removal action promptly and properly.

## IX. Recommendation

This Action Memorandum documents the selected removal action for sediment at SWMU 7b, JEB Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia, developed in accordance with CERCLA as amended, and is not inconsistent with the NCP. This decision is based on earlier investigations and evaluations documented in the Administrative Record file for JEB Little Creek.

Conditions at the site meet the NCP section 300.415(b)(2) criteria for removal action. The Naval Facilities Engineering Command Mid-Atlantic, in cooperation with the USEPA Region 3 and VDEQ, recommends approval of the proposed removal action. If approved, the total project ceiling will be \$1,910,400 (using +50 percent of the cost estimate as provided in the EE/CA). The removal action is warranted due to the potential threat to the environment from SWMU 7b, and should commence in conjunction with NTCRA activities at SWMU 3.

## X. References

CH2M HILL. 2001. *Final Site Investigation, SWMU 7 and SWMU 8, Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia*. August.

CH2M HILL. 2004. *Final Remedial Investigation, Human Health Risk Assessment, and Ecological Risk Assessment for SWMU 7 – Small Boats Sandblasting Yard, Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia*. December.

CH2M HILL. 2012. *Final Post-MILCON Evaluation, SWMU 7b – Small Boats Sandblast Yard (Desert Cove), Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia*. July.

Navy. 2005. *Final Record of Decision for SWMU 7a: Small Boats Sandblast Yard*. June.

Navy. 2006. *Department of Navy Environmental Restoration Program Manual*. November.

USEPA. 1993. *Guidance on Conducting Non-Time Critical Removal Actions Under CERCLA*, PB93-963402. August 1993.

USEPA. 2009. *Superfund Removal Guidance for Preparing Action Memoranda*.

## Figures

---



**Legend**

- SWMU 7b Study Area Boundary
- Installation Boundary





Figure 1  
 SWMU 7b Location Map  
 SWMU 7b Action Memorandum  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia



- Legend**
- Outfall
  - Combined Regulated Storm/Process Water Outfall
  - Non-Regulated Stormwater Outfall
  - Regulated Stormwater Outfall
  - Storm Sewer Line
  - ▭ Installation Boundary
  - ▭ SWMU 7 Study Area Boundary
  - ▭ Area Boundary Line
  - ▭ Limits of 2008 MILCON Dredge




Figure 2  
 SWMU 7 Boundary and Immediate Vicinity  
 SWMU 7b Action Memorandum  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia



- Legend**
- Limits of 2008 MILCON Dredge
  - Area Boundary Line
  - Removal Action Area
  - Grid Proposed for Risk Management




Figure 3  
Removal Action Area  
SWMU 7b Action Memorandum  
JEB Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia

**Attachment A**  
**Final EE/CA for SWMU 7b-Small Boats Sandblast Yard**

Final

**Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
for Solid Waste Management Unit 7b – Small Boats Sandblast Yard**

**Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia**

**Contract Task Order WE32**

**January 2013**

Prepared for

**Department of the Navy  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Mid-Atlantic**

Under the

**NAVFAC CLEAN 1000 Program  
Contract N62470-08-D-1000**

Prepared by



**Virginia Beach, Virginia**

# Executive Summary

---

This report presents an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for a non-time-critical removal action (NTCRA) for sediment at Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 7b, Small Boats Sandblast Yard at Joint Expeditionary Base (JEB) Little Creek in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

SWMU 7 is located in the north-central portion of the Base. The site was used to sandblast and paint ships until 1996, when sandblasting activities were moved to an indoor facility (CB-125). Approximately 4,000 cubic yards (yd<sup>3</sup>) of spent abrasive blast material (ABM) was stored in open piles in areas surrounding Desert Cove. No release controls were identified at SWMU 7; therefore, spent ABM was historically released to soils and Desert Cove.

For investigation purposes, SWMU 7 was subdivided by media. The terrestrial portion of the site (SWMU 7a) is composed of soil and groundwater, while the aquatic portion of the site (SWMU 7b) is composed of sediment and surface water. Following an Interim Removal Action in September 2004 to address lead-contaminated soils, the Navy, in partnership with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ), agreed that No Further Action (NFA) was required for SWMU 7a, and a Record of Decision was signed in June 2005 (Navy, 2005). Previous site investigations at SWMU 7b had identified potentially unacceptable risk to ecological receptors associated with exposure to metals in sediment.

The objective of this NTCRA is to reduce concentrations of copper, lead, mercury, and zinc in surface sediment within the SWMU 7b removal area such that remaining concentrations do not pose unacceptable risk to ecological receptors. The following four removal action alternatives were evaluated:

- Alternative 1: No action
- Alternative 2: Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill
- Alternative 3: Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill
- Alternative 4: Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill

Alternative 1 does not meet the objectives of the NTCRA to eliminate the potential for exposure to metals in sediment that may pose potential ecological risk. However, this alternative is provided as a basis for comparison.

Alternative 2 is effective in eliminating the potential for exposure to metals in sediment within the SWMU 7b removal area that may pose potential ecological risk. Following completion of this alternative, NFA would be required for sediment at SWMU 7b. Implementation of this alternative is moderately difficult to implement using common construction practices. Costs associated with Alternative 2 are moderate, similar to Alternative 3 and less expensive than Alternative 4. Alternative 2 is the recommended alternative, as it is consistent with the scope of the currently scheduled military construction (MILCON) maintenance dredge and is not significantly more expensive than other alternatives evaluated.

Alternative 3 is effective in eliminating the potential for exposure to metals in sediment within the SWMU 7b removal area that may pose potential ecological risk. Following completion of this alternative, NFA would be required for sediment at SWMU 7b. Implementation of the alternative is moderately difficult using common construction practices. Unlike Alternative 2, Alternative 3 also requires some level of onsite solidification making it slightly more difficult to implement. Additionally, the transport of waste from the site has the potential to interfere with facility activities. Costs associated with Alternative 3 are moderate, similar to Alternative 2 and less expensive than Alternative 4. Although not more difficult to implement or more expensive than Alternative 2, Alternative 3 is not recommended as it is not consistent with the scope of the currently scheduled MILCON maintenance dredge and requires procurement of additional equipment for completion of onsite solidification.

Alternative 4 is effective in eliminating the potential for exposure to metals in sediment within the SWMU 7b removal area that may pose potential ecological risk. Following completion of this alternative, NFA would be required for sediment at SWMU 7b. Implementation of this alternative is moderately difficult using common

construction practices. Unlike Alternative 2, Alternative 4 also requires some level of onsite solidification making it slightly more difficult to implement. Additionally, the transport of waste from the site has the potential to interfere with facility activities. Costs associated with Alternative 4 are moderately high; Alternative 4 is the most expensive alternative. Alternative 4 is not recommended.

In accordance with the National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan, this EE/CA will be placed in the Administrative Record and notice of its availability for public review, along with a brief summary, will be published in the local newspaper. The EE/CA will then be available for review during a 30-day public comment period, to be held from December 13, 2012 through January 13, 2013. A public information session may be held during or immediately following the public comment period, if requested. Following the public comment period, if comments are received, a Responsiveness Summary summarizing responses to significant comments will be prepared and included in the Action Memorandum describing the proposed removal action and will be placed in the Administrative Record.

# Contents

---

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Regulatory Background .....	1-1
1.2 Purpose and Objectives .....	1-2
<b>2. Site Characterization</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 JEB Little Creek Description and History.....	2-1
2.2 SWMU 7b Description and History .....	2-1
2.3 Previous Site Investigations .....	2-2
2.3.1 Risk Assessment Summary .....	2-3
2.3.2 Basis for Removal Action .....	2-5
2.4 Development of Cleanup Goals .....	2-5
2.4.1 Determination of Removal Area.....	2-5
<b>3. Identification of Objective</b> .....	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Statutory Limits on Removal Action .....	3-1
3.2 Removal Action Objective and Scope .....	3-1
3.2.1 Removal Action Objective .....	3-1
3.2.2 Removal Action Scope .....	3-1
3.3 Determination of Removal Schedule.....	3-1
3.4 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements.....	3-2
3.5 General Disposal Requirements .....	3-3
<b>4. Description and Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives</b> .....	<b>4-1</b>
4.1 Description of Removal Action Alternatives.....	4-1
4.1.1 Alternative 1—No Action.....	4-1
4.1.2 Alternative 2—Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill...	4-1
4.1.3 Alternative 3—Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill .....	4-2
4.1.4 Alternative 4—Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill .....	4-4
4.2 Evaluation Criteria .....	4-5
4.2.1 Effectiveness .....	4-5
4.2.2 Implementability .....	4-5
4.2.3 Cost .....	4-6
4.3 Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives .....	4-6
<b>5. Comparative Analysis</b> .....	<b>5-1</b>
5.1 Effectiveness .....	5-1
5.2 Implementability .....	5-2
5.3 Cost .....	5-2
<b>6. Recommended Alternative</b> .....	<b>6-1</b>
<b>7. References</b> .....	<b>7-1</b>

## **Appendixes**

- A SWMU 7b Consensus Agreement
- B ARARs
- C Cost Estimate
- D SiteWise Evaluation

## **Tables**

- 2-1 Previous Studies and Investigations Summary
- 2-2 Sediment PRGs
- 4-1 Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives
- 5-1 Remedial Alternatives Comparison

## **Figures**

- 2-1 SWMU 7b Location Map
- 2-2 SWMU 7 Boundary and Immediate Vicinity
- 2-3 Previous Sample Locations and ABM Delineation
- 2-4 Conceptual Site Model
- 2-5 Preliminary Remediation Area
- 2-6 Removal Action Area

# Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

ABM	abrasive blast material
AET	apparent effects threshold
ARAR	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
BERA	Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment
bss	below sediment surface
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	<i>Code of Federal Regulations</i>
CLEAN	Comprehensive Long-Term Environmental Action Navy
COC	contaminant of concern
COPC	contaminant of potential concern
EE/CA	Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
ER-L	effects range–low
ER-M	effects range–medium
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
HQ	Hazard Quotient
JEB	Joint Expeditionary Base
µg/kg	micrograms per kilogram
mg/kg	milligram/kilogram
MILCON	military construction
mlw	mean low water
NAB	Naval Amphibious Base
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan
NFA	no further action
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NTCRA	non-time-critical removal action
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PEL	probable effects level
PRG	preliminary remediation goal
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RI	Remedial Investigation
RQ	remediation quotient
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SERA	Screening Ecological Risk Assessment
SI	Site Investigation
SQUIRT	Screening Quick Reference Tables
SVOC	semi-volatile organic compound
SWMU	Solid Waste Management Unit
TBC	to-be-considered
TBT	tributyltin
TEL	threshold effects level
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

VDEQ Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
VPDES Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System  
yd<sup>3</sup> cubic yards

# Introduction

---

This report presents an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for a non-time-critical removal action (NTCRA) for Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 7b, Small Boats Sandblast Yard, Joint Expeditionary Base (JEB) Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia. The EE/CA is prepared under the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Long-Term Environmental Action Navy (CLEAN) Contract Number N62470-08-D-1000, Contract Task Order WE32.

For investigation purposes, SWMU 7 was subdivided by media. The terrestrial portion of the site (SWMU 7a) is composed of soil and groundwater, while the aquatic portion of the site (SWMU 7b) is composed of sediment and surface water. Following an Interim Removal Action in September 2004 to address lead-contaminated soils, the Navy, in partnership with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ), agreed that no further action was required for SWMU 7a, and a Record of Decision was signed in June 2005 (Navy, 2005).

Investigation activities for SWMU 7b were conducted in response to recommendations for further evaluation made in the Site Investigation (SI) report (CH2M HILL, 2000). The SI report identified one semi-volatile organic compound (SVOC) (benzo[a]pyrene) and two metals (arsenic and iron) as human health contaminants of potential concern (COPCs) in sediment. A Screening and Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (CH2M HILL, 2001) identified fourteen SVOCs (acenaphthene, acenaphthylene, anthracene, benzo[a]anthracene, benzo[a]pyrene, benzo[g,h,i]perylene, chrysene, dibenzo[a,h]anthracene, fluoranthene, fluorene, indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene, naphthalene, phenanthrene, and pyrene) and five metals (copper, lead, mercury, silver, and zinc) as ecological COPCs in sediment. The human health and ecological COPCs were further evaluated during the Remedial Investigation/Human Health Risk Assessment/Ecological Risk Assessment (RI/HHRA/ERA) (CH2M HILL, 2004), which identified seven metals (arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, selenium, silver, tin, and zinc) and polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) as ecological contaminants of concern (COCs) in sediment. No human health risk was identified. Following completion of a military construction (MILCON) action in 2008, which included limited dredging within SWMU 7b, potential ecological and human health risks in sediment were further evaluated. The post-MILCON action evaluation identified five metals (copper, lead, mercury, tin, and zinc) as COCs posing potentially unacceptable risks to ecological receptors (CH2M HILL, 2012). No unacceptable risks to human health were identified.

The following information is presented within this EE/CA:

- Site description
- Identification of the removal action objective
- Description of response action elements
- Identification of the removal action alternatives and technologies
- Recommendation of a preferred removal alternative
- Schedule for the selected removal alternative

## 1.1 Regulatory Background

This document is issued by the Navy, the lead agency responsible for remediation of SWMU 7b, in partnership with USEPA Region 3 and VDEQ, under Section 104 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986.

Section 104 of CERCLA and SARA allows an authorized agency to remove, or arrange for removal of, and to provide for remedial action relating to hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants at any time, or to take any other response measures consistent with the National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), as deemed necessary to protect public health or welfare and the environment.

The NCP, 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) 300, provides regulations for implementing CERCLA and SARA, and regulations specific to removal actions. The NCP defines a removal action as the following:

cleanup or removal of released hazardous substances from the environment, such actions as may be necessary to monitor, assess, and evaluate the threat of release of hazardous substances; the disposal of removed material; or the taking of such other actions as may be necessary to prevent, minimize, or mitigate damage to the public health or welfare or to the environment, which may otherwise result from a release or threat of release.

A removal action is being considered for the work element; the removal action is non-time-critical. NTCRAs are defined in 40 CFR Section 300.415(b)(4) as “actions pertaining to an imminent threat to human health and the environment and that have planning periods of 6 months or more.” Under 40 CFR Section 300.415, the lead agency is required to conduct an EE/CA when an NTCRA is planned for a site. The goals of an EE/CA are to identify the objectives of the removal action and to analyze the effectiveness, implementability, and cost of various alternatives that may satisfy these objectives. An EE/CA documents the removal action alternatives and selection process. Where the extent of the contamination is well-defined and limited in extent, NTCRAs also allow for the expedited cleanup of sites in comparison to the remedial action process under CERCLA.

Community involvement requirements for NTCRAs include preparing an EE/CA and making it available for public review and comment for a period of 30 days. An announcement of the 30-day public comment period for the EE/CA is required in a local newspaper. Written responses to significant comments will be summarized in an Action Memorandum and included in the Administrative Record.

## 1.2 Purpose and Objectives

Submittal of this document is the first step in fulfilling the requirements for NTCRAs defined by CERCLA, SARA, and the NCP. This EE/CA has been prepared in accordance with USEPA guidance document *Guidance on Conducting Non-Time-Critical Removal Actions Under CERCLA* (USEPA, 1993).

The EE/CA compares four remedial alternatives based on their technical feasibility/implementability, effectiveness (i.e., ability to protect human health and the environment and ability to prevent the potential release of hazardous constituents), and cost. Individual goals of this EE/CA are to (1) satisfy environmental review and public information requirements for removal actions, (2) satisfy Administrative Record requirements for documenting the removal action selection, and (3) provide a framework for evaluating and selecting alternative technologies.

The objectives of this NTCRA are to reduce or eliminate compounds determined to pose potential unacceptable risk to ecological receptors in SWMU 7b sediment and to achieve long-term site remediation to be protective of human health and the environment. The following alternatives were evaluated:

1. No action
2. Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill
3. Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill
4. Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill

# Site Characterization

---

## 2.1 JEB Little Creek Description and History

On October 1, 2009, Hampton Roads' first Department of Defense Joint Base was established. This new installation comprises the former Naval Amphibious Base (NAB) Little Creek and the former Army Post Fort Story; the new name for the combined installation is Joint Expeditionary Base (JEB) Little Creek-Fort Story. With the formation of this new command, the Navy assumes responsibility for management of both properties and will now merge public meetings regarding the ongoing environmental restoration programs. However, separate records will be maintained to ensure the integrity of ongoing efforts at both properties. When required for public notices and distributions, the former bases are identified jointly as JEB Little Creek-Fort Story. For Environmental Restoration Program documents, the bases are referred to separately as JEB Little Creek or JEB Fort Story.

JEB Little Creek covers approximately 2,215 acres in the northwest portion of Virginia Beach, Virginia, adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay (**Figure 2-1**). The former NAB Little Creek began operations as a permanent base in 1946. The Base's mission was the training of landing craft personnel for operational assignments. JEB Little Creek has expanded in both area and complexity of its mission over the past 65 years. Base personnel provide logistic facilities and support services for local commands, organizations, home-ported ships, and other U.S. and allied units to meet amphibious warfare-training requirements of the U.S. armed forces. Past and present operations at JEB Little Creek include vehicle and boat maintenance, boat painting and sandblasting, construction and repair of buildings and piers, mixing and application of pesticides, electroplating of musical instruments, laundry and dry cleaning, medical and dental treatment, and the generation of steam for heat. Land development surrounding the Base is residential, commercial, and industrial.

## 2.2 SWMU 7b Description and History

SWMU 7 is located at the intersection of Intercove Road and Signal Point Road in the north-central portion of the Base (**Figure 2-2**). The SWMU was used to sandblast and paint ships until 1996, when sandblasting activities were moved to an indoor facility (CB-125). Approximately 4,000 cubic yards (yd<sup>3</sup>) of spent abrasive blast material (ABM) generated between 1960 and 1982 were stored in open piles in the construction footprint of CB-125 and in the area of CB-317 and CB-318. No release controls were identified at SWMU 7; therefore, spent ABM was historically released to soils and Desert Cove.

The ground surface at SWMU 7 is covered primarily with buildings, concrete, asphalt, and hard-packed gravel. Precipitation runs off to Desert Cove or is discharged through one of 22 outfalls (11 non-regulated stormwater, 8 regulated stormwater, and 3 regulated process water) surrounding the cove with very little infiltration to groundwater. Almost the entire shoreline of SWMU 7 is bulkheaded and currently used to moor small ships. Desert Cove is a tidal marine environment connected to the Chesapeake Bay via the Connector and Little Creek Channels. All drainage to the cove is from on-Base areas, consisting mainly of buildings and asphalt parking areas. Before a MILCON action at Desert Cove completed in 2008, the area was last dredged in 1953 to a depth of 10 feet below mean low water (mlw). As part of the recent MILCON action, a pre-dredge survey was conducted in January 2008. Results indicate the deposition rate for the cove is relatively low. SWMU 7 is actively used by the facility for heavy equipment storage, small ship mooring, ship maintenance (i.e., sandblasting in Building CB-125), and training. The current and reasonably anticipated future land use of the SWMU 7 area is not expected to change.

In 2008, a MILCON action was completed to demolish and replace Piers 44 through 51, construct a new quaywall along the eastern and southern edges of the cove, and dredge limited areas surrounding the former piers. The new quaywall was constructed approximately 32 feet outboard of the former knee wall. Sheet piling was installed to a depth of 24 feet below sediment surface (bss), and all material between the sheet pile and knee wall was left in place. The roadway adjacent to the shoreline was demolished, and debris was allowed to fall in place. A new

concrete roadway was constructed along the edge of the new quaywall. Following demolition and before construction of the new piers, the area around the former piers was dredged to a depth of 10 feet below mlw (**Figure 2-2**). A closed clamshell dredge, maneuvered by a crane staged on a barge, was used to remove sediments. Before disposal, sediments were staged on a separate barge with open slots on the bottom to allow surface water to drain from the material. During use, the sediment barge was located close to the piers; however, it was moved out into the cove while awaiting dredged material disposal at Craney Island. A turbidity curtain was used periodically during dredging to encircle the area in which the clamshell was operating. On occasion, debris captured in the clamshell would prevent complete closure of the clamshell, allowing sediments to run out of the shell.

## 2.3 Previous Site Investigations

JEB Little Creek initiated environmental investigation efforts under the Navy Assessment and Control of Installation Pollutants Program in 1984. The former NAB Little Creek was placed on the National Priorities List in May 1999 (USEPA ID #VA5170022482) and investigations have since been conducted under CERCLA authority. The Federal Facility Agreement for JEB Little Creek was signed in November 2003 (Navy, 2003).

SWMU 7 has been characterized under several investigations and studies between 1989 and 2012. For investigation purposes, SWMU 7 was subdivided by media. The terrestrial portion of the site (SWMU 7a) is composed of soil and groundwater, while the aquatic portion of the site (SWMU 7b) is composed of sediment and surface water. Following an Interim Removal Action in September 2004 to address lead-contaminated soils, the Navy, in partnership with the USEPA and the VDEQ, agreed that No Further Action (NFA) was required for SWMU 7a, and a Record of Decision was signed in June 2005 (Navy, 2005). **Table 2-1** provides a chronological list and summary of previous investigations conducted at SWMU 7b. Sediment sample locations are depicted on **Figure 2-3**. The conceptual site model is shown on **Figure 2-4**. The respective investigations are a part of the Administrative Record file for JEB Little Creek and can be referenced for further details regarding specific sampling strategies, media investigations, and when and where the sampling was performed.

TABLE 2-1  
Previous Studies and Investigations Summary

Previous Study / Investigation	Date	Investigation Activities
Site Investigation (CH2M HILL, 2001)	2000	Sediment samples were collected to verify the presence or absence of contamination and to conduct a human health risk screening. Metals and PAHs were detected in sediment above human health screening criteria and identified as COPCs. Additionally, ABM was observed in sediment. The SI recommended a Screening ERA (SERA) to identify potentially complete exposure pathways for ecological receptors and an RI to define the nature and extent of contamination.
SERA and Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) (CH2M HILL, 2001)	2001	A SERA and BERA, constituting Steps 1 through 3 of the ERA process, were completed using data collected as part of the SI. Metals and PAHs in sediment exceeded ecological screening values. The BERA concluded that potentially unacceptable risks to lower-trophic level receptors were identified associated with exposure to select metals and PAHs in sediment; however, potential risks to upper-trophic-level aquatic receptors were negligible.

TABLE 2-1  
Previous Studies and Investigations Summary

Previous Study / Investigation	Date	Investigation Activities
SWMU 7 RI/HHRA/ERA (CH2M HILL, 2004)	2002	<p>During the RI/HHRA/ERA, SWMU 7b was divided into three areas – the Connector Channel, Cove, and Pier Area – to better evaluate potential risks where exposures could vary because of differences in the magnitude of contaminant levels. Sediment samples were collected in each area to define the nature and extent of contamination and to evaluate potential human health and ecological risks. Because of the tidal nature of the water body and numerous stormwater outfall drainage locations, surface water samples were not collected, as it could not be determined if any detected contaminants were from SWMU 7 or non-site-related sources. Some ABM was observed in sediment throughout the Connector Channel and Cove Areas, with greater ABM concentrations noted in the Pier Area adjacent to Pier 53. Metals and PAHs were detected above human health and ecological screening levels in all three areas; however, the quantitative HHRA identified no unacceptable human health risks from exposure to sediment. The ERA (through Step 3A) identified potentially unacceptable ecological risks to lower-trophic-level receptors exposed to metals and PAHs in sediment. In general, COPC concentrations were highest in the Pier Area and lowest in the Connector Channel. The RI recommended that further investigation of SWMU 7b sediment be conducted following completion of the scheduled MILCON action.</p>
SWMU 7b Post-MILCON Evaluation (CH2M HILL, 2012)	2009 to 2010	<p>In November 2009, surface sediment sampling was conducted to evaluate post-MILCON action conditions within the Cove, Connector Channel, and Pier Areas. In general, post-MILCON action COPC concentrations in the Connector Channel and Desert Cove Areas were similar to pre-action conditions. Concentrations of COPCs detected within the dredged portion of the Pier Area were generally similar to, or lower than, those previously detected, with the exception of the northeastern corner of the Pier Area. In August and September 2010, additional sediment sampling was conducted in the Cove, Connector Channel, and Pier Areas to evaluate the condition of the benthic invertebrate community at SWMU 7b and assess the correlation between the benthic community and metals and ABM content in sediment. The data suggest that some impacts to the benthic community are occurring in portions of the Pier Area; however, the portion of the Pier Area with the highest metals concentrations and ABM (northeast corner) did not consistently show the most impact to the benthic invertebrate community, suggesting other non-CERCLA-related factors (such as dissolved oxygen [DO]) may have more impact on the survival of the benthic invertebrate community.</p> <p>The evaluation concluded that ecological risks in the Connector Channel and Cove Area are not unacceptable, and no further action is warranted for these areas for the protection of the environment. Potentially unacceptable risks to ecological receptors were identified in the Pier Area, particularly the northeast corner. Although the current, non-CERCLA-related physical characteristics of the site may be having more of an impact on the condition of the benthic invertebrate community than the CERCLA-related metals detected in site sediment, the magnitude of these metals concentrations may result in unacceptable risks to ecological receptors should these physical characteristics change over time; therefore, site remediation at SWMU 7b is warranted. It was recommended the RAOs established for the site focus on the reduction of metals concentrations and not the establishment of a comparable (to an urban reference condition) benthic invertebrate community.</p>

### 2.3.1 Risk Assessment Summary

No potentially unacceptable risks to human health from exposure to sediment were identified. Because of the tidal nature of the water body and 21 outfalls (19 stormwater and 3 process water) surrounding the cove, any contamination detected in the surface water of the cove may or may not be associated with SWMU 7; therefore, surface water was not evaluated in the HHRA and ERA. Potential ecological risks were identified associated with constituent transport via groundwater to Desert Cove, although the ERA concluded that groundwater is not a significant transport route from the site to the Desert Cove system. Potentially unacceptable risks to lower-trophic-level receptors from exposure to arsenic, copper, lead, nickel, selenium, silver, tin, zinc and PAHs in sediment were identified.

The Tier I Partnering Team agreed that potentially unacceptable ecological risks associated with PAHs in sediment are likely primarily attributable to the 19 stormwater outfalls that convey stormwater runoff from various locations within the facility, including numerous parking areas, and not attributable to historic sandblasting activities at SWMU 7b. Therefore, PAHs in Desert Cove do not require further investigation/action as part of the SWMU 7 CERCLA release. Additionally, although arsenic, selenium, and silver may have been components of ship hull paint historically sandblasted at SWMU 7b (Navy, 2006), the Tier I Partnering Team agreed potential risks associated with these COCs in sediment are not unacceptable based upon the following:

- Arsenic was identified as a COC in the Cove Area and Pier Area during the 2004 RI, where only the discrete RI sediment samples were used to derive the list of COCs. However, this constituent is present at levels representative of the urban nature of the water body rather than historic sandblasting activities. Additionally, other potential COCs from sandblasting (copper, lead, mercury, tin, and zinc) do not show similarly uniform distributions.
- Selenium was identified as a COC in the Channel, Cove, and Pier areas during the 2004 RI, where only the discrete SI (5 samples collected in 2000) and RI (36 samples collected in 2002) sediment samples were used to derive the list of COCs. When considering both the discrete and composite RI samples, the site-wide maximum hazard quotient (HQ) for selenium, based upon the apparent effects threshold (AET) [effects range low (ER-L), effects range medium (ER-M), threshold effects level (TEL), and probable effects level (PEL) screening values have not been developed for selenium], in surface sediment is 2.50 and the site-wide mean HQ, calculated using  $\frac{1}{2}$  the detection limit for non-detected sample locations, is less than 1. All detected concentrations of selenium [maximum of 2.5 milligram per kilogram (mg/kg)] exceed the AET (1 mg/kg); however, selenium was only detected in 10 of 41 (about 25 percent) of the surface sediment samples. Detected concentrations were noted in the Connector Channel, Cove, and Pier Areas with a low range in detected concentrations (minimum of 1.3 mg/kg to maximum of 2.5 mg/kg), likely indicative of urban conditions and not a result of historic sandblasting activities.
- Silver was identified as a COC in the Pier Area during the 2004 RI, where only the discrete RI sediment samples were used to derive the list of COCs. When considering both the discrete and composite RI samples, the site-wide maximum HQ for silver, based upon the ER-L screening values), in surface sediment is 7.80 and the site-wide mean HQ is less than 1. Silver was detected in 7 of 41 (about 15 percent) of surface sediment samples and was not detected in subsurface sediment. The four sample locations that exceeded screening values [ER-L, ER-M, TEL, and/or PEL] are located within the area since removed by the MILCON action.

Additionally, per a May 21, 2012 Tier I Partnering Team consensus statement (**Appendix A**), potential ecological risk associated with tin was determined to be not unacceptable based upon the following:

- In the Pier Area, 7 of 33 (21 percent) samples analyzed for total tin between 2000 and 2010 (excluding samples collected within the dredged area) exceed maximum background for total tin.
- In the Pier Area, the mean background ratio for total tin (mean Pier Area concentration / mean background) is below 1 for all samples collected between 2000 and 2010 (excluding samples collected within the dredged area). Additionally, the mean background ratio for total tin is below 1 for each individual sampling event with the exception of the 2010 sampling event, where the mean ratio equaled 1.11.
- In the Pier Area, 11 of the 17 samples analyzed for total tin in 2009 were also analyzed for tributyltin (TBT). TBT samples were not collected as part of the 2000/2002 and 2010 sampling events. The maximum HQ (based upon the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Screening Quick Reference Tables (SQUIRT) screening value of 3.4 mg/kg) for total tin detected between 2000 and 2010 is 8.79 and the mean HQ is 2.34. The maximum HQ (based upon the NOAA SQUIRT screening value of 3.4 mg/kg) for the detected TBT fraction of total tin in 2009 is 0.002 and the mean HQ for the detected TBT fraction of total tin is 0.001. Additionally, when compared to the TEL screening value (0.048 mg/kg), the maximum HQ for the detected TBT fraction of total tin in 2009 is 0.158 and the mean HQ for the detected TBT fraction of total tin is 0.098.

- TBT was detected in each of the 11 samples collected within the Pier Area. Detected concentrations range from 2.00 micrograms per kilogram ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) to 7.60  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ . The arithmetic mean is 4.86  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  with a standard deviation of 1.48. The ratio of TBT to total tin in the Pier Area ranged from 0.00011 to 0.00076. Because of low variability in the detected TBT values, similar TBT concentrations and ratios to total tin can be expected across the site. Where both total tin and TBT were detected in samples collected in 2009, the ratio of TBT to total tin (TBT/total tin) was calculated. The average of these ratios (0.00017) was used to extrapolate the TBT fraction of the remaining total tin samples (total tin x 0.00017) collected between 2000 and 2010 for comparison to NOAA SQUIRT and TEL screening criteria. The maximum HQ (based upon the NOAA SQUIRT screening value) within the Pier Area for the extrapolated TBT fractions of total tin is 0.001 and the mean HQ for the extrapolated TBT fractions of total tin is 0.0004. Additionally, when compared to the TEL screening value, the maximum HQ for the extrapolated TBT fraction of total tin is 0.070 and the mean HQ for the extrapolated TBT fraction of total tin is 0.028.

As a result of these risk management decisions, no action is warranted for arsenic, selenium, silver, tin, and PAHs in sediment.

### 2.3.2 Basis for Removal Action

A NTCRA is currently planned for SWMU 3, the Pier 10 Sandblast Yard, in conjunction with scheduled February 2013 dry dock maintenance and MILCON maintenance dredging. Because site clean-up strategies are similar for SWMU 7b and SWMU 3, the Navy, in partnership with USEPA and VDEQ, agree that completion of an NTCRA at SWMU 7b in conjunction with SWMU 3 is warranted to avoid duplication of equipment mobilization resulting in significant increases in overall site costs. It is expected that the removal action will be the final remedy for SWMU 7b.

## 2.4 Development of Cleanup Goals

During development of clean-up goals for SWMU 3, a former sandblasting area with similar sediment COCs, regression equations developed based upon the correlation between ABM content and COC concentrations were used to calculate associated sediment concentrations using 1 percent ABM (the lowest possible integer). The resulting values generally fell between the PEL and ER-M. No correlation between ABM and metals COC concentrations at SWMU 7b was established. However, based upon the similarity of SWMU 3 and SWMU 7b, and the urban nature of Desert Cove, preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) were established as the NOAA ER-M screening value (**Table 2-2**). Because ABM itself is not toxic and does not pose risk to the environment, the presence of ABM in sediment does not drive the need for action at either site.

TABLE 2-2  
Sediment PRGs

Copper	Lead	Mercury	Zinc
270	218	0.71	410

Note: Values are in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg)

### 2.4.1 Determination of Removal Area

In line with the methodology established for SWMU 3, to define the area requiring action under CERCLA, a remediation quotient (RQ), was calculated. The RQ is defined as the ratio of the sediment concentration to the PRG. The lateral remediation area boundary was determined by calculating the RQ for each of the four COCs using all available surface sediment data. The site was broken down into 100-by-100-foot grid cells. In line with SWMU 3 and as discussed during the July 2012 Tier I Partnering Team meeting and documented herein, a grid cell is defined as being impacted if the RQ for one or more individual COCs exceeds 1.5 and the average RQ for the five COCs exceeds one. The RQ calculations for those grid cells with exceedances of criteria and the area proposed for

CERCLA sediment remediation is depicted on **Figure 2-5**. Grid cell locations LW07-L5, LW07-SD03, and LW07-M3 are proposed for elimination from the CERCLA remediation boundary based upon the following:

- Grid cell LW07-L5: Grid cell fails RQ criteria as a result of mercury detection in the 2002 composite sample; however, no other samples (2002 discrete, 2009, and 2010) from this location fail the RQ criteria.
- Grid cell LW07-SD03: Grid cell fails RQ criteria for samples collected in 2000; however, the cell is located within the MILCON action dredge limits.
- Grid cell LW07-M3: Grid cell fails RQ criteria for samples collected in 2002; however, the cell is located within the MILCON action dredge limits.

Prior to completion of the NTCRA, additional sampling to confirm COC concentrations in those grid cells proposed for elimination will be conducted. If no exceedances of criteria are noted, action will not be required within the grid. If exceedances of criteria are noted, action will be required within the entire grid cell. In establishing the area to be addressed as part of this NTCRA, the following logistical and engineering challenges were identified:

- Per facility direction, sediment cannot be dredged within 5 feet of bulk-head shoreline and 10 feet of piers, without the potential for structural impacts to the surrounding area.
- The elevation of the cove floor cannot be raised above -10 JEB Little Creek Station Vertical Datum (-11.06 mlw).
- Following dredging, the cove floor elevation must be reestablished at no less than -10 JEB Little Creek Station Vertical Datum.

Based upon these considerations, the preliminary removal area to be addressed as part of this NTCRA is depicted on **Figure 2-6**. Additional removal area delineation sampling will be conducted before completion of the NTCRA and the removal area will be expanded as necessary to eliminate the exposure pathway and mitigate potentially unacceptable ecological risks at SWMU 7b.




**Legend**

-  SWMU 7b Study Area Boundary
-  Installation Boundary



Figure 2-1  
SWMU 7b Location Map  
SWMU 7b Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
JEB Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia



**Legend**

- Outfall
- Combined Regulated Storm/Process Water Outfall
- Non-Regulated Stormwater Outfall
- Regulated Stormwater Outfall
- Storm Sewer Line
- ▭ Installation Boundary
- ▭ SWMU 7 Study Area Boundary
- ▭ Area Boundary Line
- ▭ Limits of 2008 MILCON Dredge





Figure 2-2  
 SWMU 7 Boundary and Immediate Vicinity  
 SWMU 7b Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia



- Legend**
- 2010 Sediment Sample Station Location (mid-point of grab samples)
  - ◆ 2000 SI Sediment Sample Location
  - ★ 2002 RI Composite Sediment Sample Location
  - 2009 Cove/Connector Channel Sediment Sample Location
  - ⊕ 2009 Dredged Area Sediment Sample Location
  - ⊙ 2009 Pier Area Sediment Sample Location - Low Concentrations
  - 2009 Pier Area Sediment Sample Location - High Concentrations
  - ▲ 2002 RI Discrete Sediment Sample Location

- Area Boundary Line
- Surface Sediment ABM Content (per 2009 and 2010 Sampling)**
- ≤ 1%
- 1-5%
- 5-10%
- Limits of 2008 MILCON Dredge





Figure 2-3  
 Previous Sample Locations and ABM Delineation  
 SWMU 7b Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia



**LEGEND**


- Water Table
- Stormwater Runoff
- Sheet Flow

Vertical exaggeration 1" = 20'

**FIGURE 6**  
 SWMU 7b Conceptual Site Model  
 SWMU 3 and SWMU 7b Remedial Action  
 Delineation Sediment Sampling UFP-SAP  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia

**Benthic Dwelling Organisms** (worms, insects, crustaceans):  
 Ingestion of and direct contact with surface sediment.

**FIGURE 2-4**  
 Conceptual Site Model  
 SWMU 7b Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia



LW07-M1-SD304		
11/24/2009		
Discrete		
COC	Individual RQ	Average RQ
Copper	0.63	1.04
Lead	0.60	
Mercury	0.89	
Zinc	2.05	

LW07-SD301*		
11/23/2009		
Discrete		
COC	Individual RQ	Average RQ
Copper	0.93	2.41
Lead	2.69	
Mercury	2.49	
Zinc	3.51	

LW07-M1			
SD301		SD401	
11/24/2009		9/10/2010	
Discrete			
COC	Individual RQ	Average RQ	Individual RQ
Copper	0.50	1.05	0.47
Lead	1.07		1.08
Mercury	0.71		1.70
Zinc	1.94		1.73

LW07-SD403		
9/11/2010		
Discrete		
COC	Individual RQ	Average RQ
Copper	0.58	1.12
Lead	0.97	
Mercury	0.53	
Zinc	2.41	

LW07-M3			
SD201		SD202	
9/28/2002		9/28/2002	
Discrete			
COC	Individual RQ	Average RQ	Individual RQ
Copper	0.45	1.22	0.46
Lead	0.49		0.50
Mercury	0.63		0.51
Zinc	3.32		1.87

LW07-SD03		
6/1/2000		
Discrete		
COC	Individual RQ	Average RQ
Copper	0.30	2.38
Lead	8.30	
Mercury	0.24	
Zinc	0.69	

LW07-L5							
SD201		SD202		SD301		SD401	
9/28/2001		9/28/2002		11/23/2009		9/11/2010	
Discrete		Composite		Discrete		Discrete	
COC	Individual RQ	Average RQ	Individual RQ	Average RQ	Individual RQ	Average RQ	Individual RQ
Copper	0.33	0.53	0.39	1.96	0.35	0.5	0.37
Lead	0.32		0.66		0.25		0.29
Mercury	0.58		5.77		0.44		0.37
Zinc	0.88		1.02		0.98		0.97

- Legend**
- 2000 Sediment Sample Location
  - ▲ 2002 RI Discrete Sediment Sample Location
  - ◆ 2009 Pier Area Sediment Sample Location - Low Concentrations
  - 2009 Pier Area Sediment Sample Location - High Concentrations
  - ⊗ 2009 Dredged Area Sediment Sample Location
  - 2009 Cove/Connector Channel Sediment Sample Location
  - ◇ 2010 Composite Surface Sediment Sample Locations
  - 2010 Surface Water Quality Sample Locations
  - Limits of 2008 MILCON Dredge
  - Area Boundary Line
  - Preliminary Remediation Area
  - Grid Proposed for Risk Management




Figure 2-5  
Preliminary Remediation Area  
SWMU 7b Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
JEB Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia



**Legend**  
[Green Outline] Removal Action Area  
[Blue Outline] Area Boundary Line




Figure 2-6  
Removal Action Area  
SWMU 7b Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
JEB Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia

# Identification of Objective

---

## 3.1 Statutory Limits on Removal Action

The NCP (40 CFR Part 300.415) dictates statutory limits of \$2 million and 12 months of USEPA fund-financed removal actions, with statutory exemptions for emergencies and actions consistent with the remedial action to be taken. This removal action will not be USEPA fund financed. The Navy/Marine Corps installation restoration manual does not limit the cost or duration of the removal action; however, cost-effectiveness is a recommended criterion for the evaluation of removal action alternatives.

## 3.2 Removal Action Objective and Scope

### 3.2.1 Removal Action Objective

The removal action objective in this EE/CA will address SWMU 7b sediment, as shown on **Figure 2-6** and expanded as necessary following additional sediment sampling. There are no potentially unacceptable human health risks associated with current or future exposure to SWMU 7b sediment; therefore, no action is required for this medium for the protection of human health. The removal action objective for the protection of the environment is as follows:

- Reduce concentrations of copper, lead, mercury, and zinc in sediment such that remaining concentrations do not pose unacceptable risk to ecological receptors.

### 3.2.2 Removal Action Scope

In the preparation of this EE/CA, removal action alternatives were scoped and developed to meet the objective listed above. The scope of the engineering measures for each removal alternative is defined in this section.

1. No action: The no action alternative means that no removal work will be done at this site.
2. Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill: The sediment removal area would be dredged and backfilled with a clean sand layer. This option would mitigate potentially unacceptable risk and would incorporate actions for erosion and sediment control and upland disposal.
3. Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill: The sediment removal area would be dredged and backfilled with a clean sand layer. This option would mitigate potentially unacceptable risk and would incorporate actions for erosion and sediment control, onsite dredge spoil solidification, and upland disposal.
4. Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill: The sediment removal area would be dredged and backfilled with a clean sand layer. This option would mitigate potentially unacceptable risk and would incorporate actions for erosion and sediment control, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, and upland disposal.

## 3.3 Determination of Removal Schedule

The EE/CA will be placed in the Administrative Record, and notice of its availability for public review, along with a brief summary, will be published in the local newspaper. The EE/CA will be available for a 30-day public comment period. The public comment period is scheduled to be from December 13, 2012 through January 13, 2013. A public information session will be held during or immediately following the public comment period, if requested. If public comments are received during the public comment period, a Responsiveness Summary summarizing responses to significant comments will be prepared and included in the Administrative Record. Because this removal action has been designated non-time-critical, the main factor controlling the start date of the NTCRA is

completion of the SWMU 3 NTCRA during the removal and maintenance of the dry dock and anchoring system, scheduled to begin in February 2013 and take approximately 90 days to complete.

The total project period is anticipated to last 9.5 months from the beginning of the public comment period to completion of the associated construction completion documentation. Mobilization for completion of the NTCRA will correspond with completion of the SWMU 3 NTCRA. The following presents critical milestone periods related to the EE/CA:

- EE/CA public comment period—30 days
- Subcontracting, work plan, and mobilization—3 months
- Removal action—1 month
- CERCLA documentation—4 months

### 3.4 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

As required by Section 121 of CERCLA, remedial actions carried out under Section 104 or secured under Section 106 must attain the levels of standards of control for hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants specified by the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) of federal and state environmental laws and state facility-siting laws, unless waivers are obtained. However, as required by USEPA policy 40 CFR Section 300.415(j), ARARs will be identified and attained for removal actions to the extent practicable. Two factors will be applied to determine whether the identification and attainment of ARARs is practicable in a particular removal situation: (1) the urgency of the situation; and (2) the scope of the removal action to be conducted.

ARARs are identified by USEPA as either being applicable to a situation or relevant and appropriate to it. These distinctions are critical to understanding the constraints imposed on response alternatives by environmental regulations other than CERCLA. The following definitions of ARARs are from the USEPA guidance (USEPA, 1998):

- “Applicable” requirements are standards and other environmental protection requirements of federal or state law dealing with a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, action being taken, location, or other circumstance at a CERCLA site.
- “Relevant and appropriate” requirements are standards and environmental protection criteria of federal or state law that, although not “applicable” to a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, action being taken, location, or other circumstance, address problems or situations sufficiently similar to those encountered at the CERCLA site that their use is well suited to the particular site. The procedure to determine if a requirement is relevant and appropriate is a two-step process. A requirement is “relevant” if it addresses problems or situations sufficiently similar to the circumstances of the proposed response action. A requirement is “appropriate” if it would also be well suited to the conditions of the site.

A requirement may be “relevant” to a particular situation but not “appropriate,” given site-specific circumstances; such a requirement would not be an ARAR for the site. A requirement that is relevant and appropriate must be met as if it were applicable.

“To-be-considered” (TBC) criteria are non-promulgated advisories or guidance issued by federal or state government that are not legally binding, and do not have the status of potential ARARs. TBCs are evaluated along with ARARs and may be implemented when ARARs are not fully protective of human health and the environment.

Another factor in determining which response requirement must be met is whether the requirement is substantive or administrative. Onsite CERCLA response actions must meet substantive requirements but not administrative requirements. Substantive requirements are those dealing directly with actions or with conditions in the environment. Administrative requirements implement the substantive requirements by prescribing procedures such as fees, permitting, and inspection that make substantive requirements effective. This distinction applies to onsite actions only; offsite response actions are subject to all applicable standards and regulations, including administrative requirements such as permits.

Three classifications of requirements are defined by USEPA in the ARAR determination process: chemical-specific, location-specific, and action-specific.

*Chemical-specific ARARs* are health or risk management-based numbers or methodologies that result in the establishment of numerical values for a given medium that would meet the NCP threshold criterion of overall protection of human health and the environment. These requirements generally set protective cleanup concentrations for the COCs in the designated media, or set safe concentrations of discharge for response activity. Chemical-specific requirements are generally set for a single chemical or closely related group of chemicals and do not typically consider mixtures of chemicals. When chemical-specific requirements do not adequately protect human health or the environment, cleanup goals may be set by the TBC value. Federal and Commonwealth of Virginia chemical-specific regulations that have been reviewed are summarized in **Appendix B**.

*Location-specific ARARs* restrict response activities and media concentrations based on the characteristics of the surrounding environments. Location-specific ARARs may include restrictions on response actions within wetlands or floodplains, near locations of known endangered species, or on protected waterways. Federal and Commonwealth of Virginia location-specific regulations that have been reviewed are summarized in **Appendix B**.

*Action-specific ARARs* are usually technology- or activity-based requirements or limitations on actions taken with respect to hazardous substances. Federal and Commonwealth of Virginia action-specific ARARs that may affect the development and conceptual arrangement of response alternatives are summarized in **Appendix B**.

## 3.5 General Disposal Requirements

Waste disposal procedures implemented for the removal action will be in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. For the purposes of this EE/CA, the cost estimates were based on the assumption that excavated sediment will be non-hazardous. Waste characterization testing will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the disposal facility. Any materials classified as hazardous will be appropriately transported and disposed of in accordance with applicable requirements. All materials will be disposed of in a state-permitted disposal facility that is approved by the Navy and is permitted to accept CERCLA waste.

## SECTION 4

# Description and Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives

---

A sediment removal action is planned for SWMU 7b based upon the removal area identification presented in Section 2.6. The alternatives for this NTCRA were developed using professional judgment and information from previous investigations. Alternatives were evaluated based on effectiveness, implementability, and cost. The no action alternative was evaluated for comparative purposes.

## 4.1 Description of Removal Action Alternatives

### 4.1.1 Alternative 1—No Action

With the no action alternative, no removal work will be done, no controls will be implemented, and the site will remain in its current condition, leaving the impacted sediment in place. This alternative does not represent the final action for the site. The need for additional action will be evaluated as part of a forthcoming ROD. It is assumed that the current level of maintenance will be sustained.

### 4.1.2 Alternative 2—Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill

Alternative 2 includes the removal and offsite disposal of impacted sediment followed by placement of a clean sand layer. This section discusses the elements of this removal.

#### Pre-Delineation Sampling

Before completion of the work planning phase, pre-delineation surface and subsurface sediment sampling will be conducted to determine the final removal area and required final dredging depths. As a result of the equipment being utilized (mechanical dredge), a minimum of 1 foot of sediment will be removed, plus an allowance for an additional 1 foot of overdredge (2 feet total). For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed that removal of 2 feet of impacted sediment within the preliminary removal area is required, plus an allowance for an additional 1 foot of overdredge (3 feet total).

#### Mobilization

Before removal activities, utility locating will be performed to identify any underground and overhead utilities that may impact the removal action. A MILCON maintenance dredging is scheduled to take place at the facility during the timeframe of this NTCRA; therefore, it is assumed the same dredging subcontractor will be used and no mobilization costs will be associated with the dredge equipment or personnel. A pre-removal bathymetric survey will be completed to confirm the pre-excavation surface elevations and identify any large anomalies within the removal area. If any large debris is identified, a debris sweep will be performed before dredging.

#### Dredging

Removal of sediment will be performed using a mechanical dredge outfitted with a clamshell bucket specifically designed for environmental sediment removal projects. The dredge will be positioned on scows to allow for easier movement around Desert Cove and prevent disturbance to upland activities. Turbidity and sheens in the dredging area will be reduced through use of the environmental clamshell bucket and controlled with silt curtains and oil booms. Dredged sediment will be loaded onto water-tight scows and moved to an onsite staging area for dewatering. Intermediate bathymetric surveys will be performed during dredging activities. Following completion of dredging, a post-removal bathymetric survey will be completed to confirm contract dredging depths were achieved.

## Dewatering

Dredged sediment will undergo passive dewatering within water-tight scows for a period of time by allowing solids to settle to the bottom of the scows. The overlying water will be pumped through a filter system located on the barge and discharged to Desert Cove. Before transporting the dredged sediment for offsite disposal, waste characterization sampling will be conducted. All materials will be disposed of in accordance with state regulations at a state-permitted disposal facility that is approved by the Navy and is permitted by USEPA to accept CERCLA waste.

## Barge Decontamination

Following completion of all dredging and sediment solidification, each scow will be decontaminated onsite. Decontamination fluids will be containerized for waste characterization and transported to a CERCLA-approved facility (Soilex Facility in Suffolk, Virginia) for disposal.

## Site Restoration

Following completion of the post-removal bathymetric survey, the site will be restored through placement of a clean sand layer across the entire grid cell. Prior to placement, sand will be sampled to determine its suitability for use as clean fill. Sampling requirements and clean fill criteria will be determined during the work-planning phase. A minimum of six inches of clean, medium-grained sand will be placed across the dredged area and remaining portions of the grid cell not dredged; however, enough sand will be placed to re-establish the cove floor elevation to -10.92 feet mean lower low water (-10 feet JEB Little Creek Station Vertical Datum). For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed 2 feet of sand will be required over the dredged areas in each grid cell (full replacement of dredged sediment), with 6-inches of sand placed in those areas not dredged. Sand placement will be verified by collecting sediment cores for visual confirmation of thickness. Following completion of sand placement, a bathymetric survey of the area will be completed to confirm re-establishment of the cove floor to the specified elevation and determine final site conditions.

## Short-Term Monitoring

Short-term monitoring will be required during the construction phase to protect human health and the environment. Monitoring requirements may include turbidity and water quality monitoring and noise monitoring; requirements will be defined during the work planning phase.

### 4.1.3 Alternative 3—Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill

Alternative 3 includes the removal of, onsite solidification of, and offsite disposal of impacted sediment followed by placement of a clean sand layer. This section discusses the elements of this removal.

## Pre-Delineation Sampling

Before completion of the work planning phase, pre-delineation surface and subsurface sediment sampling will be conducted to determine the final removal area and required final dredging depths. As a result of the equipment being utilized (mechanical dredge), a minimum of 1 foot of sediment will be removed, plus an allowance for an additional 1 foot of overdredge (2 feet total). For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed that removal of 2 feet of impacted sediment within the preliminary removal area is required, plus an allowance for an additional 1 foot of overdredge (3 feet total).

## Mobilization

Before removal activities, utility locating will be performed to identify any underground and overhead utilities that may impact the removal action. A MILCON maintenance dredging is scheduled to take place at the facility during the timeframe of this NTCRA; therefore, it is assumed the same dredging subcontractor will be used and no mobilization costs will be associated with the dredge equipment or personnel. A pre-removal bathymetric survey will be completed to confirm the pre-excavation surface elevations and identify any large anomalies within the removal area. If any large debris is identified, a debris sweep will be performed before dredging.

## Dredging

Removal of sediment will be performed using a mechanical dredge outfitted with an environmental clamshell bucket. The dredge will be positioned on scows to allow for easier movement around Desert Cove and to prevent disturbance to upland activities. Turbidity and sheens in the dredging area will be reduced through use of the environmental clamshell bucket and controlled with silt curtains and oil booms. Dredged sediment will be loaded onto water-tight scows and moved to an onsite staging area for dewatering and solidification. Intermediate bathymetric surveys will be performed during dredging activities. Following completion of dredging, a post-removal bathymetric survey will be completed to confirm contract dredging depths were achieved.

## Dewatering and Solidification

Dredged sediment will undergo passive dewatering within water-tight scows for a period of time by allowing solids to settle to the bottom of the scows. The overlying water will be pumped through a filter system located on the barge and discharged to Desert Cove.

The dewatered sediment will then be stabilized onsite. For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed that Portland cement will be used for solidification. Solidification will be performed to the degree needed for the dredged sediment to pass the paint filter test. Solidification within the scow will be accomplished by a rotary mixing head attached to an extended reach excavator or similar equipment. After solidification and waste characterization, the material will be off-loaded directly from the scow and trucked to a CERCLA-approved Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle D Landfill (Bethel Landfill in Hampton, Virginia) for disposal. All materials will be disposed of in accordance with state regulations at a state-permitted disposal facility that is approved by the Navy and is permitted by USEPA to accept CERCLA waste.

## Barge Decontamination

Following completion of all dredging and sediment solidification, each scow will be decontaminated onsite. Decontamination fluids will be containerized for waste characterization and transported to a CERCLA-approved facility (Soilex Facility in Suffolk, Virginia) for disposal.

## Site Restoration

Following completion of the post-removal bathymetric survey, the site will be restored through placement of a clean sand layer across the entire grid cell. Prior to placement, sand will be sampled to determine its suitability for use as clean fill. Sampling requirements and clean fill criteria will be determined during the work-planning phase. A minimum of six inches of clean, medium-grained sand will be placed across the dredged area and remaining portions of the grid cell not dredged; however, enough sand will be placed to reestablish the cove floor elevation to -10.92 feet mean lower low water (-10 feet JEB Little Creek Station Vertical Datum). For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed 2 feet of sand will be required over the dredged areas in each grid cell (full replacement of dredged sediment), with 6-inches of sand placed in those areas not dredged. Sand placement will be verified by collecting sediment cores allowing for visual confirmation of thickness. Following completion of sand placement a bathymetric survey of the area will be completed to confirm re-establishment of the cove floor to the specified elevation and determine final site conditions.

## Short-Term Monitoring

Short-term monitoring will be required during the construction phase to protect human health and the environment. Monitoring requirements may include turbidity and water quality monitoring, dust and air quality monitoring, and noise monitoring; requirements will be defined during the work planning phase.

### 4.1.4 Alternative 4—Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill

Alternative 4 includes the removal, onsite passive dewatering and solidification, and offsite disposal of impacted sediment followed by placement of a clean sand layer. This section discusses the elements of this removal.

## Pre-Delineation Sampling

Before completion of the work planning phase, pre-delineation surface and subsurface sediment sampling will be conducted to determine the final removal area and required final dredging depths. As a result of the equipment being utilized (mechanical dredge), a minimum of 1 foot of sediment will be removed, plus an allowance for an additional 1 foot of overdredge (2 feet total). For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed that removal of 2 feet of impacted sediment within the preliminary removal area is required, plus an allowance for an additional 1 foot of overdredge (3 feet total).

## Mobilization

Before removal activities, utility locating will be performed to identify any underground and overhead utilities that may impact the removal action. A MILCON maintenance dredging is scheduled to take place at the facility during the timeframe of this NTCRA; therefore, it is assumed the same dredging subcontractor will be used and no mobilization costs will be associated with the dredge equipment or personnel. Additionally, it is assumed the material staging area for the onsite geotube dewatering operations constructed for completion of the SWMU 3 NTCRA will be used for completion of the SWMU 7b NTCRA; therefore, there are no associated costs. A pre-removal bathymetric survey will be completed to confirm the pre-excavation surface elevations and identify any large anomalies within the removal area. If any large debris is identified, a debris sweep will be performed before dredging.

## Dredging

Removal of sediment will be performed using a mechanical dredge outfitted with an environmental clamshell bucket. The dredge will be positioned on scows to allow for easier movement around Desert Cove and to prevent disturbance to upland activities. Turbidity and sheens in the dredging area will be reduced through use of the environmental clamshell bucket and controlled with silt curtains and oil booms. Dredged sediment will be loaded onto water-tight scows and moved to an onsite staging area for dewatering. Intermediate bathymetric surveys will be performed during dredging activities. Following completion of dredging, a post-removal bathymetric survey will be completed to confirm contract dredging depths were achieved.

## Dewatering and Solidification

Dredged sediment will undergo passive dewatering via geotube at an onsite staging area. Dredged materials will be pumped from the scow into geotubes staged upland. During pumping, it is assumed that a cationic polymer will need to be added to enhance dewatering of dredged sediment. Weep water from the geotubes will be collected in a secondary containment system and subsequently pumped through an onsite temporary water treatment system prior to point source discharge to Desert Cove.

The dewatered sediment will then be stabilized onsite. For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed that Portland cement will be used for solidification. Solidification will be performed to the degree needed for the dewatered sediment to pass the paint filter test. Solidification within the material staging area will be accomplished using an extended reach excavator or similar equipment. After dewatering and waste characterization, the material will be off-loaded directly from the staging area and trucked to a CERCLA-approved RCRA Subtitle D Landfill (Bethel Landfill in Hampton, Virginia) for disposal. All materials will be disposed of in accordance with state regulations at a state-permitted disposal facility that is approved by the Navy and is permitted to accept CERCLA waste.

## Barge Decontamination

Following completion of all dredging and sediment solidification, each scow will be decontaminated onsite. Decontamination fluids will be containerized for waste characterization and transported to a CERCLA-approved facility (Soilex Facility in Suffolk, Virginia) for disposal.

## Site Restoration

Following completion of the post-removal bathymetric survey, the site will be restored through placement of a clean sand layer across the entire grid cell. Prior to placement, sand will be sampled to determine its suitability for use as clean fill. Sampling requirements and clean fill criteria will be determined during the work-planning phase.

A minimum of six inches of clean, medium-grained sand will be placed across the dredged area and remaining portions of the grid cell not dredged; however, enough sand will be placed to reestablish the cove floor elevation to -10.92 feet mean lower low water (-10 feet JEB Little Creek Station Vertical Datum). For the purposes of this EE/CA, it is assumed 2 feet of sand will be required over the dredged areas in each grid cell (full replacement of dredged sediment), with 6-inches of sand placed in those areas not dredged. Sand placement will be verified by collecting sediment cores allowing for visual confirmation of thickness. Following completion of sand placement a bathymetric survey of the area will be completed to confirm re-establishment of the cove floor to the specified elevation and determine final site conditions.

### Short-Term Monitoring

Short-term monitoring will be required during the construction phase to protect human health and the environment. Monitoring requirements may include turbidity and water quality monitoring, dust and air quality monitoring, and noise monitoring; requirements will be defined during the work planning phase.

## 4.2 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria are based on *Guidance on Conducting Non-Time-Critical Removal Actions Under CERCLA*, PB93-963402 (USEPA, 1993).

### 4.2.1 Effectiveness

The *effectiveness* criterion addresses the expected results of the removal alternatives. It includes two major subcategories: protectiveness and ability to achieve the removal objectives.

- Protectiveness
  - Protective of public health and community
  - Protective of workers during implementation
  - Protective of the environment
  - Compliant with ARARs
- Ability to achieve removal objectives
  - Ability to meet the expected level of treatment or containment
  - Has no residual effect concerns
  - Maintain long-term control

In addition to the protectiveness and ability to achieve the removal objective subcategories, a sustainability assessment was conducted using SiteWise, a stand-alone tool that assesses the environmental footprint of a remedial alternative to compare the overall life-cycle environmental impacts of each remedy (Battelle, 2010). The sustainability assessment provides an additional comparison criterion that may allow options with a smaller environmental impact to be selected when all other criteria are met.

### 4.2.2 Implementability

The *implementability* criterion encompasses the technical and administrative feasibility of the removal action. It includes three subcategories: technical feasibility, availability of resources, and administrative feasibility.

- Technical feasibility
  - Construction and operational consideration
  - Demonstrated performance and useful life
  - Adaptability to environmental conditions
  - Contribution to performance of long-term removal actions
  - Implementation within the allotted time
- Availability of resources

- Availability of equipment
  - Availability of personnel and services
  - Laboratory testing capacity
  - Offsite treatment and disposal capacity
  - Post-removal site control
- Administrative feasibility
    - Required permits and/or easement or rights-of-way
    - Impacts on adjoining property
    - Ability to impose institutional controls
    - Likelihood of obtaining exemptions from statutory limits (if needed)

### 4.2.3 Cost

The cost criterion encompasses the life-cycle costs of a project, including the projected implementation costs and the long-term operational and maintenance costs of the remedial action. For the detailed cost analysis, the expenditures required to complete each alternative were estimated in terms of capital costs to complete initial construction activities, including direct and indirect costs. Direct costs include the cost of construction, equipment, land and site development, treatment, transportation, and disposal. Indirect costs include engineering expenses and contingency allowances. No annual operations and maintenance costs are associated with any alternatives.

The estimated costs are provided to an expected accuracy of +50 percent and –30 percent. The alternative cost estimates are in 2012 dollars and the unit pricing is based on costs from similar projects, vendor quotes, or engineering estimates. The enclosed Engineer's Estimate (**Appendix C**) is only an estimate of possible construction costs for budgeting purposes.

## 4.3 Analysis of Removal Action Alternatives

**Table 4-1** provides a summary of the alternative analysis with respect to effectiveness, ease of implementation, and cost. **Appendix C** provides cost estimate details pertaining to each alternative discussed in the following sections. The results using the sustainability analysis tool SiteWise for each alternative is included in **Appendix D**.

TABLE 4-1  
Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Effectiveness	Ease of Implementation	Cost
Alternative 1—No Action	- No removal work performed; site left as is	<p><i>Protectiveness</i> Potentially unacceptable ecological risk will remain onsite.</p> <p><i>Compliance with ARARs</i> This alternative does not comply with chemical-specific ARARs. Location- and Action-specific ARARs do not apply.</p> <p><i>Ability to Achieve Removal Action Objective</i> This alternative does not meet the removal action objective.</p> <p><i>Sustainability</i> No short-term sustainability impacts because no action is implemented.</p>	<p><i>Technical Feasibility</i> No action to implement.</p> <p><i>Availability of Resources</i> No resources required.</p> <p><i>Administrative Feasibility</i> No action to implement.</p>	\$0.00
Alternative 2— Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill	<p>- Removal of impacted sediment</p> <p>- On scow dewatering of sediment for upland disposal in a RCRA Subtitle D Landfill via scow transport</p> <p>- Site restoration through placement of clean sand layer</p>	<p><i>Protectiveness</i> Very effective in eliminating potentially unacceptable risk to ecological receptors.</p> <p><i>Compliance with ARARs</i> This alternative achieves the chemical-, location-, and action-specific ARARs.</p> <p><i>Ability to Achieve Removal Action Objective</i> This alternative meets the remedial action objective to reduce concentrations of site COCs in sediment such that remaining concentrations do not pose unacceptable risk to ecological receptors. Removal of contaminated sediment would permanently eliminate the potential threat to the environment through removal of the exposure pathway. An immediate reduction in the contaminant levels, toxicity, and volume in the sediment would be anticipated. Because the excavated materials will be disposed of at a landfill, the alternative would not meet the NCP preference of onsite treatment and site reuse over land disposal.</p> <p><i>Sustainability</i> This alternative poses a potential environmental impact because of transportation of equipment, operation of equipment, and residual handling.</p>	<p><i>Technical Feasibility</i> The implementation of this alternative would require common construction activities and the use of standard dredging, materials handling, and hauling equipment. This alternative would require a contractor experienced in environmental dredging who would be required to develop a Dredging Work Plan.</p> <p><i>Availability of Resources</i> Site access and resources will be readily available during the proposed timeframe of the removal action for the type of equipment necessary to execute this work.</p> <p><i>Administrative Feasibility</i> Alternative will require permits for the offsite solidification. This alternative would require manifests prepared by licensed waste haulers. No permanent deed restrictions would be required.</p>	\$1,273,600
Alternative 3— Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill	<p>- Removal of impacted sediment</p> <p>- On scow dewatering and onsite solidification of sediment via on scow mixing, and sediment offload for upland disposal in a RCRA Subtitle D Landfill via trucking</p> <p>- Site restoration through placement of clean sand layer</p>	<p><i>Protectiveness</i> Very effective in eliminating potentially unacceptable risk to ecological receptors.</p> <p><i>Compliance with ARARs</i> This alternative achieves the chemical-, location-, and action-specific ARARs.</p> <p><i>Ability to Achieve Removal Action Objective</i> This alternative meets the remedial action objective to reduce concentrations of site COCs in sediment such that remaining concentrations do not pose unacceptable risk to ecological receptors. Removal of contaminated sediment would permanently eliminate the potential threat to the environment through removal of the exposure pathway. An immediate reduction in the contaminant levels, toxicity, and volume in the sediment would be anticipated. Because the excavated materials will be disposed of at a landfill, the alternative would not meet the NCP preference of onsite treatment and site reuse over land disposal.</p> <p><i>Sustainability</i> This alternative poses a potential environmental impact because of transportation of equipment, operation of equipment, and residual handling.</p>	<p><i>Technical Feasibility</i> The implementation of this alternative would require common construction activities and the use of standard dredging, sediment solidification, materials handling, and hauling equipment. This alternative would require a contractor experienced in environmental dredging who would be required to develop a Dredging Work Plan.</p> <p><i>Availability of Resources</i> Site access and resources will be readily available during the proposed timeframe of the removal action for the type of equipment necessary to execute this work. This alternative would require available property for construction of a materials staging area and use of facility roadways for waste hauling.</p> <p><i>Administrative Feasibility</i> This alternative would require manifests prepared by licensed waste haulers. No permanent deed restrictions would be required.</p>	\$1,254,300

TABLE 4-1  
Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Effectiveness	Ease of Implementation	Cost
<p>Alternative 4— Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removal of impacted sediment</li> <li>- Onsite passive dewatering via geotube of sediment for upland disposal in a RCRA Subtitle D Landfill via trucking</li> <li>- Site restoration through placement of clean sand layer</li> </ul>	<p><i>Protectiveness</i></p> <p>Very effective in eliminating potentially unacceptable risk to ecological receptors.</p> <p><i>Compliance with ARARs</i></p> <p>This alternative achieves the chemical-, location-, and action-specific ARARs.</p> <p><i>Ability to Achieve Removal Action Objective</i></p> <p>This alternative meets the remedial action objective to reduce concentrations of site COCs in sediment such that remaining concentrations do not pose unacceptable risk to ecological receptors. Removal of contaminated sediment would permanently eliminate the potential threat to the environment through removal of the exposure pathway. An immediate reduction in the contaminant levels, toxicity, and volume in the sediment would be anticipated. Because the excavated materials will be disposed of at a landfill, the alternative would not meet the NCP preference of onsite treatment and site reuse over land disposal.</p> <p><i>Sustainability</i></p> <p>This alternative poses a potential environmental impact because of transportation of equipment, operation of equipment, and residual handling.</p>	<p><i>Technical Feasibility</i></p> <p>The implementation of this alternative would require common construction activities and the use of standard dredging, sediment dewatering, materials handling, and hauling equipment. This alternative would require a contractor experienced in environmental dredging who would be required to develop a Dredging Work Plan.</p> <p><i>Availability of Resources</i></p> <p>Site access and resources will be readily available during the proposed timeframe of the removal action for the type of equipment necessary to execute this work. This alternative would require available property for construction of a materials staging area and use of facility roadways for waste hauling.</p> <p><i>Administrative Feasibility</i></p> <p>This alternative would require manifests prepared by licensed waste haulers. No permanent deed restrictions would be required.</p>	<p>\$1,858,400</p>

SECTION 5

# Comparative Analysis

Section 5 provides a comparative analysis of the removal alternatives to assist in the decision-making process by which an alternative will be selected. In the previous section, the removal alternatives were independently screened according to their effectiveness, ease of implementability, and cost. In this section, the alternatives are compared to each other for their relative metrics. From this analysis, it should become clear which alternative is preferable in each category and, consequently, which will be selected for implementation at SWMU 7b. **Table 5-1** summarizes the results of the alternative comparison.

TABLE 5-1  
Remedial Alternatives Comparison

Alternative	Effectiveness	Implementation	Cost
Alternative 1—No Action	Not Effective	Easy	No cost
Alternative 2— Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill	Effective	Moderate	Moderate
Alternative 3— Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill	Effective	Moderate	Moderate
Alternative 4— Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, an replacement with clean fill	Effective	Moderate	Moderately High

## 5.1 Effectiveness

Alternative 1 is not effective. It is not protective of human health and the environment, does not comply with ARARs, and does not achieve the removal action objective of this EE/CA. Because Alternative 1 is not protective of human health and the environment, ARARs were not even considered. Alternative 1 involves no action and therefore has no short-term sustainability impacts.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are all effective in meeting the removal action objective and providing for long-term protection because each will result in removal of contaminated sediment within the removal area boundary, eliminating the pathway for ecological receptor exposure to COCs in sediment. Each alternative includes the removal and offsite disposal of contaminated sediment. Given the appropriate training and personal protective equipment, each alternative is protective to workers during construction. Because excavated sediment from each alternative would require transportation and offsite disposal, there is a small potential for exposing surrounding communities to the contaminants during transport and disposal. Each alternative poses an environmental impact because of transportation of equipment, operation of equipment, and residual handling. Alternative 2 poses a slightly greater environmental impact because the sediment will be transported up the James River to Port Weanack. None of the three removal alternatives meets the NCP’s preference for onsite treatment and site reuse over land disposal. Each removal alternative achieves the chemical-, location-, and action-specific ARARs and the compliance with ARARs during implementation of the alternatives is summarized in **Appendix B**.

## 5.2 Implementability

Alternative 1 involves no action and therefore is easy to implement.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are technically and administratively feasible, and resources for implementing the alternatives are readily available. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 will follow all applicable federal and state regulations for offsite transportation and disposal activities. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 can be accomplished utilizing standard construction methods and readily available resources. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 each require some level of onsite dewatering. Alternatives 3 and 4 also require some level of onsite sediment solidification. Sediment solidification, dewatering, and construction of a material staging area are standard dredging processes and the equipment, materials, and labor force would be readily available. However, Alternatives 3 and 4 are slightly more difficult to implement than Alternative 2 as they require construction of onsite material staging areas and would require haul truck access to and from SWMU 3. The material staging areas and large volume of haul trucks required for Alternatives 3 and 4 have the potential to interfere with facility activities.

## 5.3 Cost

Alternative 1 has no cost and is therefore the least expensive. The cost estimates for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are provided in **Appendix C** and summarized in **Table 4-1**. Alternative 2 is estimated at \$1,273,600 (-30% = 891,600; +50% = 1,910,400), Alternative 3 is estimated at \$1,254,300 (-30% = 878,100; +50% = 1,881,500), and Alternative 4 is estimated at \$1,858,400 (-30% = 1,300,900; +50% = 2,787,600). Alternative 4 is the most expensive alternative. Costs associated with Alternatives 2 and 3 are essentially the same.

## SECTION 6

# Recommended Alternative

---

Based on the comparative analysis of the removal alternatives completed in Section 5 and the scheduled MILCON maintenance dredge and SWMU 3 NTCRA, the recommended removal alternative is mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and replacement with clean fill, as described in Alternative 2. Alternative 2 is consistent with the current scope of the MILCON maintenance dredge, consisting of mechanical dredging with an environmental clamshell bucket and upland disposal via scow transport to Port Weanack; requires only the addition of sand placement to the existing MILCON scope of work; and is not significantly more expensive than the other alternatives evaluated.

Alternative 2 will require removal of contaminated sediment and site restoration through placement of a clean sand layer. The sediment will be disposed of offsite following waste characterization. Upon completion of the removal action, potential risk to ecological receptors will be mitigated and NFA will be required for sediment.

## SECTION 7

# References

---

- Battelle. 2011. *SiteWise™ Version 2 User Guide*. NAVFAC Engineering Service Center, UG-2092-ENV. June.
- CH2M HILL. 2001. *Final Site Investigation, SWMU 7 and SWMU 8, Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia*. August.
- CH2M HILL. 2001a. *Draft Screening and Baseline (Steps 1-3) Ecological Risk Assessment for SWMUs 7 and 8*. January.
- CH2M HILL. 2004. *Final Remedial Investigation, Human Health Risk Assessment, and Ecological Risk Assessment for SWMU 7 – Small Boats Sandblasting Yard, Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia*. December.
- CH2M HILL. 2012. *Final Post-MILCON Evaluation, SWMU 7b – Small Boats Sandblast Yard (Desert Cove), Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia*. July.
- Navy. 2003. *Final Federal Facility Agreement*. November.
- Navy. 2005. *Final Record of Decision for SWMU 7a: Small Boats Sandblast Yard*. June.
- Navy. 2006. *Performance Specification Paint System, Anticorrosive and Antifouling, Ship Hull*. June.
- Rogers, Golden and Halpern. 1984. *Initial Assessment Study of Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek, Norfolk, Virginia*. December.
- USEPA, 1993. *Guidance on Conducting Non-Time Critical Removal Actions Under CERCLA*, PB93-963402. August 1993.
- USEPA. 1998. OSWER Publication 9234.1-01. *“CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual, Part I (Interim Final)”*. August. EPA/540/G-89/006, PB90-272535.

**Appendix A**  
**SWMU 7b Consensus Agreement**

---

**Consensus Agreement**  
**Environmental Restoration SWMU 7b**  
**Small Boats Sandblast Yard (Desert Cove)**

**JEB Little Creek**  
**Virginia Beach, Virginia**

The use of Abrasive Blast Material (ABM) during historic sandblasting operations at the Small Boats Sandblast Yard (SWMU 7) resulted in the deposition of ABM and metals on the surrounding land (SWMU 7a) and water (SWMU 7b - Desert Cove). Human health risks associated with SWMU 7a were addressed through a NTCRA under CERCLA. No unacceptable ecological risks associated with SWMU 7a were identified. SWMU 7a was closed with no further action under a ROD in 2005. No unacceptable human health risks associated with surface water and sediment in SWMU 7b (Desert Cove) were identified. Potentially unacceptable risks from exposure to metals in sediment at SWMU 7b were identified. The JEB Little Creek Tier I Partnering Team, consisting of representatives from NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic, USEPA Region III, and VDEQ, agree ecological risks associated with the concentrations of tin detected in sediment at SWMU 7b are not unacceptable per the following lines of evidence:

- In the Pier Area, 7 of 33 (21%) samples analyzed for total tin between 2000 and 2010 (excluding samples collected within the dredged area) exceed maximum background for total tin.
- In the Pier Area, the mean background ratio for total tin (mean Pier Area concentration / mean background) is below 1 for all samples collected between 2000 and 2010 (excluding samples collected within the dredged area). Additionally, the mean background ratio for total tin is below 1 for each individual sampling event with the exception of the 2010 sampling event where the mean ratio equaled 1.11.
- In the Pier Area, 11 of the 17 samples analyzed for total tin in 2009 were also analyzed for TBT. TBT samples were not collected as part of the 2000/2002 and 2010 sampling events. The maximum HQ (based upon the NOAA SQUIRT screening value of 3.4 mg/kg) for total tin detected between 2000 and 2010 is 8.79 and the mean HQ is 2.34. The maximum HQ (based upon the NOAA SQUIRT screening value of 3.4 mg/kg) for the detected TBT fraction of total tin in 2009 is 0.002 and the mean HQ for the detected TBT fraction of total tin is 0.001. Additionally, when compared to the TEL screening value (0.048 mg/kg), the maximum HQ for the detected TBT fraction of total tin in 2009 is 0.158 and the mean HQ for the detected TBT fraction of total tin is 0.098.
- TBT was detected in each of the 11 samples collected within the Pier Area. Detected concentrations range from 2.00 µg/kg to 7.60 µg/kg. The arithmetic mean is 4.86 µg/kg with a standard deviation of 1.48. The ratio of TBT to total tin in the Pier Area ranged from 0.00011 to 0.00076. Due to low variability in the detected TBT values, similar TBT concentrations and ratios to total tin can be expected across the site. Where both total tin and TBT were detected in samples collected in 2009, the ratio of TBT to total tin (TBT/total tin) was calculated. The average of these ratios (0.00017) was used to extrapolate the TBT fraction of the remaining total tin samples (total tin x 0.00017) collected between 2000 and 2010 for comparison to NOAA SQUIRT and TEL screening criteria. The maximum HQ (based upon the NOAA SQUIRT screening value) within the Pier Area for the extrapolated TBT fractions of total tin is 0.001 and the mean HQ for the extrapolated TBT fractions of total tin is 0.0004. Additionally, when compared to the TEL screening value, the maximum HQ for the extrapolated TBT fraction of total tin is 0.070 and the mean HQ for the extrapolated TBT fraction of total tin is 0.028

As a result of this risk management decision, no action is warranted for tin in sediment. The remaining COCs at SWMU 7b are copper, mercury, nickel, and zinc. Because of the urban nature of Desert Cove, the Tier I Team agrees to the use of the NOAA ER-M screening value as the preliminary remediation goal (PRG) for the



**Appendix B**  
**ARARs**

---

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ARAR	Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement	POTW	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
BTAG	Biological Technical Assistance Group	ppm	Parts per Million
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act	RBC	Risk-Based Concentrations
CFC	Chlorofluorocarbon	RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations	SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
DCR	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	SMCL	Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level
DNH	Division of Natural Heritage	TBC	To Be considered
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level	TCLP	Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure
MCLG	Maximum Contaminant Level Goal	TSCA	Toxic Substance Control Act
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers
NESHAPs	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants	USC	United States Code
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
NSDWRs	National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations	VA	Virginia
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards	VAC	Virginia Administrative Code
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyls	VMRC	Virginia Marine Resource Commission
PMCL	Primary Maximum Contaminant Level	VPA	Virginia Pollutant Abatement
		VPDES	Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

## References

Commonwealth of Virginia, 2004. Preliminary Identification, Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements.

USEPA, 1998. *CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual: Interim Final*. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. EPA/540/G-89/006.

USEPA, 1998. *CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual: Part II. Clean Air Act and Other Environmental Statutes*. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response. EPA/540/G-89/009.

USEPA, 1998. RCRA, Superfund & EPCRA Hotline Training Manual. Introduction to Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements. EPA540-R-98-020.

TABLE B-1

Federal Chemical-Specific ARARs

SWMU 7b EE/CA

JEB Little Creek

Virginia Beach, Virginia

Media	Requirement	Prerequisite	Citation	Alternative	ARAR/TBC Determination	Comment
<b>Project Remediation Goals</b>						
Sediment	Guidance document regarding how to conduct a technically defensible ecological risk assessment	Assessment of potential ecological risks.	Interim Final Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Process for Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments (EPA, June 1997). Copper (inorganic/metal) CAS #7440-50-8, Lead (inorganic/metal) CAS #7439-92-1, Mercury (inorganic/metal) CAS #7439-97-6, and Zinc (inorganic/metal) CAS #7440-66-6	2, 3, 4	TBC	The objective of the removal action at SWMU 7b is to reduce or eliminate risks to ecological receptors from copper, lead, mercury, and zinc in sediment. Project remediation goals (PRGs) for each contaminant of concern (COC) are below: Copper - 270 mg/kg Lead - 218 mg/kg Mercury - 0.71 mg/kg Zinc - 410 mg/kg

TABLE B-2

## Virginia Chemical-Specific ARARs

SWMU 7b EE/CA

JEB Little Creek

Virginia Beach, Virginia

Media	Requirement	Prerequisite	Citation	Alternative	ARAR Determination	Comment
<b>Wastewater Treatment</b>						
Surface Water	Contains minimum standards for surface water quality. No discharge to surface water may cause these criteria to be violated.	Applicable to any discharge of industrial wastewater to state waters.	9 VAC 25-260-140A, 9 VAC 25-260-140B only as it pertains to Copper (CAS #7440-50-8), Lead (CAS #7439-92-1), and Zinc (CAS #7440-66-6)	2,3	Applicable	Alternatives 2 and 3 will include discharge of decant water to Desert Cove. Based on this process, the sediment COCs with specific limits have criteria listed that will be controlled as part of the discharge. There are no standards specified for mercury. Treatment of the decant water to concentrations that are below background is not required. However, once removed, contaminated sediment must be prevented from discharging back to Desert Cove while dewatering occurs. Effluent sampling will not be required during discharge activities. Monitoring for visual changes in turbidity and sheen will be conducted.
			9 VAC 25-260-140A, 9 VAC 25-260-140B only as it pertains to Copper (CAS #7440-50-8), Lead (CAS #7439-92-1), and Zinc (CAS #7440-66-6), pH, and Temperature	4	Applicable	Alternative 4 includes treatment of the dredge slurry by filtration and the addition of a cationic polymer. Based on that process, the COCs with specific limits, pH, temperature, and toxicity have criteria listed that will be controlled as part of the discharge. There are no standards specified for mercury. The final set of standards that will need to be monitored will be set after the design of the treatment system is completed.

TABLE B-3

**Federal Location-Specific ARARs****SWMU 7b EE/CA****JEB Little Creek****Virginia Beach, Virginia**

Location	Requirement	Prerequisite	Citation	Alternative	ARAR Determination	Comment
<b>Migratory Flyway</b>						
Migratory bird area	Protects almost all species of native birds in the United States from unregulated taking.	Presence of migratory birds.	<i>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</i> ; 16 USC 703	2, 3, 4	Applicable	SWMU 7b is located in the Atlantic Migratory Flyway. If migratory birds, or their nests or eggs, are identified at SWMU 7b, operations will not destroy the birds, nests or eggs.
<b>Coastal Zone</b>						
Coastal zone or area that will affect the coastal zone	Federal activities must be consistent with, to the maximum extent practicable, State coastal zone management programs. Federal agencies must comply with the consistency requirements of 15 CFR § 930.	Actions that may affect identified coastal zone resources or uses	15 CFR 930.33(a)(1), (a)(2), (b); .35(a), (b); .36(a)	2, 3, 4	Applicable	Activities at SWMU 7b that will affect Virginia's coastal zone will be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with Virginia's enforceable policies. Activities performed on-site and in compliance with CERCLA are not subject to administrative review; however the substantive requirements of making a consistency determination will be met.

TABLE B-4

## Virginia Location-Specific ARARs

## SWMU 7b EE/CA

## JEB Little Creek

## Virginia Beach, Virginia

Location	Requirement	Prerequisite	Citation	Alternative	ARAR Determination	Comment
<b>Wetlands</b>						
Wetlands	Mitigate or minimize the loss of wetlands and the adverse ecological effects of all permitted activities. To preserve the wetlands as much as possible in their natural state and to consider appropriate requirements for compensation only after it has been proven that the loss of the natural resource is unavoidable and that the project will have the highest public and private benefit. Commitments to preserve other existing wetlands shall not ordinarily be an acceptable form of compensation.	If a wetlands zoning ordinance has been adopted by local government, in accordance with the <i>General Provisions Relating to Marine Resources Commission</i> , and the response action is not exempt from its provisions, the project must comply with the requirements of the ordinance. In the case of absence of an ordinance, or of an exemption to it, VMRC can exercise jurisdiction over tidal wetlands.	4 VAC 20-390-40, 50	2, 3, 4	Relevant and Appropriate	It is not anticipated that onsite activities will disturb the existing wetland areas. The dredging operation will not result in a net loss of wetland area.
<b>Presence of Threatened and Endangered Species or Habitat</b>						
Area where endangered species are present	Identified federal and state threatened and endangered species are protected from unlawful taking. This requirement includes prohibition of activities that adversely affect critical habitat. The list of federal threatened and endangered species is incorporated into state law along with additions.	Activity in an area where listed threatened or endangered species are present or in an area that is designated as their critical habitat.	4VAC 15-20-130 (c), 2 VAC 5-320-10 (as it references §3.2-1003)	2, 3, 4	TBC	Per Navy policy, state-listed species are protected through the implementation of an Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP). Compliance with the INRMP will constitute compliance with all substantive requirements in the regulations for this action.

TABLE B-5

## Federal Action-Specific ARARs

## SWMU 7b EE/CA

## JEB Little Creek

## Virginia Beach, Virginia

Action	Requirement	Prerequisite	Citation	Alternative	ARAR Determination	Comment
<b>Dredge and Fill</b>						
Discharge of dredge-and-fill	No discharge of dredged or fill material will be allowed unless appropriate and practicable steps are taken that minimize potential adverse impacts of the discharge on the aquatic ecosystem.	Discharges of dredged or fill material to surface waters, including wetlands.	40 CFR 230.10(d); 33 CFR 320.4(a), (b), (d), (p), (r)	2, 3, 4	Applicable	Onsite actions may include removal of sediments as well as dewatering removed sediment. These actions will be taken in accordance with the substantive provisions of Nationwide Permit 38. Steps will be taken to minimize the impacts to the ecosystem.
<b>Storage of Petroleum and Non-petroleum Oils</b>						
Storage of fuels and oils (petroleum and non-petroleum) onsite	If storage capacity limits are exceeded a Spill, Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan must be prepared and implemented with procedures, methods, equipment, and other requirements to prevent the discharge of into or upon the navigable waters of the United States.	Total onsite storage capacity exceeding 1,320 gallons in containers that are 55 gallons or larger in size.	40 CFR 112.3(a)(1); 112.5; 112.6(a)(1), (a)(3)*; 112.7(a)(3)(i), (a)(3)(iv), (a)(3)(vi),(a)(4), (a)(5), (c), (e), (f),(g),(k); 112.8(b)(1), (b)(2), (c)(1), (c)(3), (c)(6), (c)(10), and (d)(4)  *the provisions incorporated by reference here are not ARARs unless they are also listed in this table.	2, 3, 4	Applicable	It is anticipated that fuels or other treatment chemicals will be stored onsite. If the storage capacity in containers that are 55 gallons or greater is equal to or exceeds 1,320 gallons a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan must be prepared and implemented. Containers include oil and fuel reservoirs in equipment. Onsite CERCLA actions are not subject to administrative requirements such as administrative reviews and endorsements.

TABLE B-6

## Virginia Action-Specific ARARs

## SWMU 7b EE/CA

## JEB Little Creek

## Virginia Beach, Virginia

Action	Requirement	Prerequisite	Citation	Alternative	ARAR Determination	Comment
<b>Dredge and Fill</b>						
Dredging, filling, and/or discharging pollutants into, or adjacent to, surface waters (including wetlands)	Regulations for activities undertaken in State surface waters	Activities such as dredging, filling, or discharging any pollutant into or adjacent to surface waters, or otherwise altering the physical, chemical, or biological properties of surface waters; excavating in wetlands; or conducting the following activities in a wetland: 1. New activities to cause draining that significantly alters or degrades existing wetland acreage or functions.	9 VAC 25-210-90(F)(1), (2), (3); 115(C)(1)	2, 3, 4	Applicable	The removal area at SWMU 7b will be dredged to remove the impacted sediment and place a clean sand layer over the dredged areas. The clean sand layer will provide a layer of clean fill over the dredged area which will eliminate the need for post-dredging confirmation sampling. The substantive provisions of these regulations will be met, however onsite CERCLA actions are not subject to permitting. Measures that will be taken to protect water quality will be detailed in the remedial design or remedial action work plan.
Erosion and deposits of soil/sediment caused by land disturbing activities	Regulations for the effective control of soil erosion, sediment deposition and nonagricultural runoff which must be met in any control program to prevent the unreasonable degradation of properties, stream channels, waters and other natural resources.	Construction activities that will disturb more than 10,000 square feet of land.	Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations, 4 VAC 50-30-40-2; 12; 14; 15; 16(c); and 19(k)	2, 3, 4	Relevant and Appropriate	Since the response action occurs in a live watercourse and along its beds and banks, the only requirements in 4 VAC 50-30-40 that are relevant and appropriate to the response action itself are 12, 14, and 15. However, additional site work will be required to facilitate the response action including the construction of temporary access roads, material and equipment staging areas, and support facilities.
<b>Waste Management</b>						
Handling and storage of solid waste onsite in waste piles	Establishes standards and procedures pertaining to the management of solid wastes in stockpiles.	On-site management of wastes that meet the definition of solid waste in piles.	9 VAC 20-81-330(F)(1); 330(F)(2)(a)(1), (e),(f); 330(F)(4)	3	Applicable	Dredged sediment may be staged onsite in piles during the response action. In the event that staging piles are used they will be managed in accordance with these requirements.

TABLE B-6

**Virginia Action-Specific ARARs**  
**SWMU 7b EE/CA**  
**JEB Little Creek**  
**Virginia Beach, Virginia**

Action	Requirement	Prerequisite	Citation	Alternative	ARAR Determination	Comment
Accumulation and/or treatment of hazardous waste in staging piles onsite	A staging pile must be designed constructed and maintained to prevent the migration of hazardous constituents other media. The design must consider location, hydrogeology, and any other factors that may reasonably influence the migration of hazardous constituents. Closure requirements are also included.	Accumulation or treatment of hazardous wastes in staging piles onsite	9 VAC 20-60-264 only as it incorporates 40 CFR 264.554(d)(1)(ii), (d)(2)	3, 4	Relevant and Appropriate	These requirements are applicable to operating a staging pile for treatment or staging of hazardous wastes in piles during this action. Staging piles will be designed and operated in accordance with these standards; however, since this is a CERCLA action no permit will be required. These requirements are applicable only if hazardous waste is generated and treated or staged in piles.
Treatment of hazardous waste in containers	Containers used for treatment must be in good condition and compatible with the waste being treated. The containers must also be kept closed unless adding or removing waste, handled to minimize the possibility of failure, and inspected weekly. The containers must also be protected from contact with precipitation.	Treatment of hazardous wastes in containers onsite	9 VAC 20-60-264 only as it incorporates 40 CFR 264.171 through 174, and 175(c)	3	Applicable	Applicable if hazardous waste will be treated ex situ in containers.
<b>Wastewater Treatment</b>						
Discharge to state waters	The Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) regulates point source discharges to state waters.	Treatment of wastewater prior to discharge	9 VAC 25-31-190(D), (E), (J)(1), J(3), J(4); 200(A)(2)(a) and (A)(2)(b).	4	Applicable	The water treatment system will be designed and operated to meet the substantive requirements of the VPDES system. Onsite CERCLA actions are not subject to administrative requirements such as administrative reviews or permitting.
<b>Dust Control</b>						
Generation of fugitive dust	Regulations regarding reasonable precautions to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne.	Conducting any activity which may cause particulate matter to become airborne.	9 VAC 5-50-90	3, 4	Applicable	Dust control measures will be implemented during activities at the site.

**Appendix C**  
**Cost Estimate**

---

**Table C-1**  
**Engineer's Cost Estimate for Alternative 2: Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement**  
**SWMU 7b EE/CA**  
**JEB Little Creek**  
**Virginia Beach, Virginia**

Description: Alternative 2 ( Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement) includes removal of contaminated sediment within the proposed removal area boundary. The total removal area is estimated to be 38,525 ft<sup>2</sup>. Assumed dredge depth is 2 feet with an additional 1 foot of over-dredge. The total removal volume is estimated to be 4,281 yd<sup>3</sup>.

Cost Item	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Cost	Cost Estimate Reference	Assumptions and Notes
<b>Pre-Dredge Sampling</b>						
<b>In-situ Waste Characterization Sampling</b>						
Sediment Sampling	LS	1	\$ 18,980.00	\$ 18,980.00	Recent similar projects	- Includes all sampling labor and expenses - Includes vibracore and IDW subcontractor costs
Sample Analysis	EA	6	\$ 1,710.63	\$ 10,263.78	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Includes analysis of full TCLP (VOCs, SVOCs, metals, herbicides, and pesticides), BTEX, PCBs, TPH, EOX, dioxins, reactivity, ignitability, and corrosivity.
<b>Site Preparation Activities</b>						
<b>Dredging</b>						
Dredge Equipment Mobilization	LS	0	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes MILCON Contractor already onsite
Dredge Personnel Mobilization	LS	0	\$ 29,180.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes MILCON Contractor already onsite
Utility Locate	LS	1	\$ 975.00	\$ 975.00	Recent similar projects	- Includes mobilization, demobilization, and all labor, equipment, and materials.
Bathymetric Survey Mobilization/Demobilization	LS	1	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	Recent similar projects	- Assumes mobilization/demobilization of two-man survey crew and all associated supplies and equipment.
Pre-Removal Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
Debris Sweep	Day	1	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	Recent similar projects	- Assumes equipment rented locally as needed when large debris is located
Turbidity Curtain	LF	0	\$ 28.75	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes turbidity curtain will already be onsite for SWMU 3 NTCRA
Turbidity Curtain Installation/Removal	LS	1	\$ 3,910.00	\$ 3,910.00	Recent similar projects	- Includes labor and boat for installation and removal of system
<b>Water Treatment System</b>						
Mobilization and Equipment Installation	LS	0	\$ 45,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA - Based on same Alternative selected for dredging SWMU 3 and SWMU 7b
<b>Dredging and Disposal</b>						
<b>Dredging</b>						
Dredging	yd <sup>3</sup>	4,281	\$ 27.25	\$ 116,657.25	Recent similar projects	- Assumes dredging 5 days per week M-F 12 hr/day. - Includes labor, mechanical dredge use, and fuel
Work-in-Progress Bathymetric Survey	Day	2	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 8,050.00	Recent similar projects	Bathymetric surveys will be completed following completion of each removal grid to identify need for additional dredging prior to dredge equipment downtime or demobilization. Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
Post-Removal Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
<b>Scow Free Water Removal</b>						
Scow Free Water Removal	Day	12	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 27,600.00	Recent similar projects	- Includes 20 ton crane for pump maneuvering, sump pump, and labor
Water Treatment Operations	Day	12	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	Recent similar projects	- Includes fuel, labor, and rental of frac tank, sand filter, and carbon
T&D of Water Treatment System Components	LS	0	\$ 1,250.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Water Quality Samples	EA	12	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	Recent similar projects	Includes labor, material, and equipment for 3 effluent, 6 inline and 3 surface water samples for turbidity.
<b>Sediment Transportation and Disposal</b>						
Waste Characterization Sampling	EA	5	\$ 76.70	\$ 383.50	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Assumes 1 sample per barge (approx. 1000 yds <sup>3</sup> ) for analysis of TPH and paint filter test. - Includes volume of sediment and portland cement.
Offsite Disposal Waste Management	Ton	7,064	\$ 45.25	\$ 319,630.16	Per quotes from Port Weanack and Waste Management Charles City Landfill	- Assumes 10% by weight stabilization agent mix ratio - Includes sediment stabilization, loading sediment from scow to truck, and transporting sediment to the landfill
Disposal @ Subtitle D Landfill	Ton	7,064	\$ 25.00	\$ 176,591.25	Per quote from Waste Management Charles City Landfill	- Tonnage includes portland cement
Disposal @ Subtitle D Landfill (debris)	Ton	4	\$ 50.00	\$ 200.00	Per quote from Waste Management Charles City Landfill	- Tonnage based on recent similar projects
<b>Decontamination Water Transportation and Disposal</b>						
Scow travel for Decontamination	EA	0	\$ 3,600.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Barge Survey and Report	LS	0	\$ 7,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Waste Characterization Sampling	EA	0	\$ 864.04	\$ -	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Transport to Disposal Facility	Load	0	\$ 665.00	\$ -	Per quote from Summit Environmental	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Disposal @ Soilex Facility, Suffolk, VA	gal	0	\$ 0.25	\$ -	Per quote from Summit Environmental.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Solids Surcharge	gal	0	\$ 0.70	\$ -	Per quote from Summit Environmental	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Site Restoration/Demobilization</b>						
<b>Water Treatment System</b>						
Demobilization	LS	0	\$ 7,500.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Sand Layer Placement</b>						
Mobilization/Demobilization	LS	0	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Well Graded Sand (Washed Sand 100+)	Ton	4,654	\$ 20.00	\$ 93,081.85	Recent similar projects	- Includes cost for purchase/delivery and 15% loss
Placement of Well Graded Sand	yd <sup>3</sup>	2,891	\$ 12.00	\$ 34,688.89	Recent similar projects	- Includes use of sand spreader (barge and long reach excavator), fuel, and labor.
<b>Site Survey</b>						
Final Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day Conducted following completion of sand layer placement
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$861,087</b>			
Contingency (15%)			\$129,163			
General Conditions (10%)			\$86,109			
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$1,076,358</b>			
Performance Bond (2%)			\$21,527		Industry Average	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$1,097,886</b>			
Design Costs (8%)			\$87,831		Includes Closeout Reports	
Construction Oversight (8%)			\$87,831			
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL COST</b>			<b>\$1,273,600</b>		<b>+50%</b>	
					<b>-30%</b>	
					<b>\$1,910,400</b>	
					<b>\$891,600</b>	

- Notes**
1. Base costs used are 2012 dollars.
  2. For the bathymetric survey the dredge subcontractor will be responsible for coordinating with the surveyor to insure schedule efficiency. Navy will not be responsible for dredging delay due to surveyor. Survey will occur immediately after dredging is complete. Dredger will not leave dredging area until survey is confirmed.
  3. Assumes that 90% of the free dredge water from the scows will be removed before turnover of the scows to the offloading contractor.
  4. The enclosed Engineer's Cost Estimate based on seamless dredging operation from completion of SWMU 3 to start of SWMU 7b dredging.
  5. The enclosed Engineer's Estimate is only an estimate of possible construction costs for budgeting purposes. This estimate is limited to the conditions existing at its issuance and is not a guarantee of actual price or cost. Uncertain market conditions such as, but not limited to: local labor or contractor availability, wages, other work, material market fluctuations, price escalations, force majeure events, and developing bidding conditions etc may affect the accuracy of this estimate. CH2M Hill is not responsible for any variance from this estimate or actual prices and conditions obtained.

**Table C-2**  
**Engineer's Cost Estimate for Alternative 3: Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placement**  
**SWMU 7b EE/CA**  
**JEB Little Creek**  
**Virginia Beach, Virginia**

Description: Alternative 3 ( Mechanical dredging, onsite stabilization, upland disposal, and sand layer placement) includes removal of contaminated sediment within the proposed removal area boundary. The total removal area is estimated to be 38,525 ft<sup>2</sup>. Assumed dredge depth is 2 feet with an additional 1 foot of overdredge. The total removal volume is estimated to be 4,281 yd<sup>3</sup>.

Cost Item	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Cost	Cost Estimate Reference	Assumptions and Notes
<b>Pre-Dredge Sampling</b>						
<b>In-situ Waste Characterization Sampling</b>						
Sediment Sampling	LS	0	\$ 18,980.00	\$ 18,980.00	Recent similar projects	- Includes all sampling labor and expenses - Includes vibracore and IDW subcontractor costs
Sample Analysis	EA	6	\$ 1,710.63	\$ 10,263.78	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Includes analysis of full TCLP (VOCs, SVOCs, metals, herbicides, and pesticides), BTEX, PCBs, TPH, EOX, dioxins, reactivity, ignitability, and corrosivity.
<b>Site Preparation Activities</b>						
<b>Dredging</b>						
Dredge Equipment Mobilization	LS	0	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes MILCON Contractor already onsite
Dredge Personnel Mobilization	LS	0	\$ 29,180.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes MILCON Contractor already onsite
Utility Locate	LS	1	\$ 975.00	\$ 975.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes mobilization, demobilization, and all labor, equipment, and materials.
Bathymetric Survey Mobilization/Demobilization	LS	1	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes mobilization/demobilization of two-man survey crew and all associated supplies and equipment.
Pre-Removal Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects.	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
Debris Sweep	Day	1	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes equipment rented locally as needed when large debris is located
Turbidity Curtain	LF	0	\$ 28.75	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes turbidity curtain will already be onsite for SWMU 3 NTCRA
Turbidity Curtain Installation/Removal	LS	1	\$ 3,910.00	\$ 3,910.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes labor and boat for installation and removal of system
Material Staging Area Civil Construction	LS	0	\$ 130,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Water Treatment System</b>						
Mobilization and Equipment Installation	LS	0	\$ 45,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA - Based on same Alternative selected for dredging SWMU 3 and SWMU 7b
<b>Dredging and Disposal</b>						
<b>Dredging</b>						
Dredging	yd <sup>3</sup>	4,281	\$ 27.25	\$ 116,657.25	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes dredging 5 days per week M-F 12 hr/day. - Includes labor, mechanical dredge use, and fuel
Work-in-Progress Bathymetric Survey	Day	2	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 8,050.00	Recent similar projects.	Bathymetric surveys will be completed following completion of each removal grid to identify need for additional dredging prior to dredge equipment downtime or demobilization. Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
Post-Removal Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects.	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
<b>Scow Free Water Removal</b>						
Scow Free Water Removal	Day	12	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 27,600.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes 20 ton crane for pump maneuvering, sump pump, and labor
Water Treatment Operations	Day	12	\$ 3,350.00	\$ 40,200.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes sump maintenance (submersible pumps, generator, mini excavator for sump cleaning), fuel, labor, and rental of frac tank, sand filter, and carbon
T&D of Water Treatment System Components	LS	0	\$ 1,250.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Water Quality Samples	EA	12	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	Recent similar projects.	Includes labor, material, and equipment for 3 effluent, 6 inline and 3 surface water samples for turbidity.
<b>Solidification</b>						
Sediment Solidification	yd <sup>3</sup>	4,281	\$ 51.00	\$ 218,331.00	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes 10% by weight portland cement. Includes purchase/delivery of portland cement, equipment mobilization/demobilization, labor, and equipment
Barge Survey and Report	LS	0	\$ 7,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Sediment Transportation and Disposal</b>						
Loading	ton	7,064	\$ 4.50	\$ 31,786.43	Recent similar projects.	- Tonnage includes portland cement. Includes front end loader and excavator.
Waste Characterization Sampling	EA	5	\$ 76.70	\$ 383.50	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Assumes 1 sample per barge (approx. 1000 yds <sup>3</sup> ) for analysis of TPH and paint filter test. - Includes volume of sediment and portland cement.
Transport to Landfill	Ton	7,064	\$ 9.00	\$ 63,572.85	Per quote from Waste Management Bethel Landfill	- Tonnage includes portland cement
Disposal @ Subtitle D Landfill	Ton	7,064	\$ 20.00	\$ 141,273.00	Per quote from Waste Management Bethel Landfill	- Tonnage includes portland cement
Disposal @ Subtitle D Landfill (debris)	Ton	4	\$ 50.00	\$ 200.00	Per quote from Waste Management Bethel Landfill	- Tonnage based on recent similar projects
<b>Decontamination Water Transportation and Disposal</b>						
Dredge, Scows, & Equipment Decontamination	LS	0	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Waste Characterization Sampling	EA	0	\$ 864.04	\$ -	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Transport to Disposal Facility	Load	0	\$ 665.00	\$ -	Per quote from Summit Environmental.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Disposal @ Soilx Facility, Suffolk, VA	gal	0	\$ 0.25	\$ -	Per quote from Summit Environmental.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Site Restoration/Demobilization</b>						
<b>Material Staging Area</b>						
Demobilization	LS	0	\$ 35,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Water Treatment System</b>						
Demobilization	LS	0	\$ 7,500.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Sand Layer Placement</b>						
Mobilization/Demobilization	LS	0	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Well Graded Sand (Washed Sand 100+)	Ton	4,654	\$ 20.00	\$ 93,081.85	Recent similar projects.	- Includes cost for purchase/delivery and 15% loss
Placement of Well Graded Sand	yd <sup>3</sup>	2,891	\$ 12.00	\$ 34,688.89	Recent similar projects.	- Includes use of sand spreader (barge and long reach excavator), fuel, and labor
<b>Site Survey</b>						
Final Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects.	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day Conducted following completion of sand layer placement
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$848,029</b>		
Contingency (15%)				\$127,204		
General Conditions (10%)				\$84,803		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$1,060,036</b>		
Performance Bond (2%)				\$21,201	Industry Average	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$1,081,236</b>		
Design Costs (8%)				\$86,499	Includes Closeout Reports	
Construction Oversight (8%)				\$86,499		
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL COST</b>				<b>\$1,254,300</b>	<b>+50%</b>	<b>\$1,881,500</b>
					<b>-30%</b>	<b>\$878,100</b>

- Notes**
1. Base costs used are 2012 dollars.
  2. For the bathymetric survey the dredge subcontractor will be responsible for coordinating with the surveyor to insure schedule efficiency. Navy will not be responsible for dredging delay due to surveyor. Survey will occur immediately after dredging is complete. Dredger will not leave dredging area until survey is confirmed.
  3. Assumes that 90% of the free dredge water from the scows will be removed before turnover of the scows to the offloading contractor.
  4. The enclosed Engineer's Cost Estimate based on seamless dredging operation from completion of SWMU 3 to start of SWMU 7b dredging.
  5. The enclosed Engineer's Estimate is only an estimate of possible construction costs for budgeting purposes. This estimate is limited to the conditions existing at its issuance and is not a guarantee of actual price or cost. Uncertain market conditions such as, but not limited to: local labor or contractor availability, wages, other work, material market fluctuations, price escalations, force majeure events, and developing bidding conditions etc may affect the accuracy of this estimate. CH2M Hill is not responsible for any variance from this estimate or actual prices and conditions obtained.

**Table C-3**  
**Engineer's Cost Estimate for Alternative 4: Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement**  
**SWMU 7b EE/CA**  
**JEB Little Creek**  
**Virginia Beach, Virginia**

Description: Alternative 4 ( Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement) includes removal of contaminated sediment within the proposed removal area boundary. The total removal area is estimated to be 38,525 ft<sup>2</sup>. Assumed dredge depth is 2 feet with an additional 1 foot of overredge. The total removal volume is estimated to be 4,281 yd<sup>3</sup>.

Cost Item	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Cost	Cost Estimate Reference	Assumptions and Notes
<b>Pre-Dredge Sampling</b>						
<b>In-situ Waste Characterization Sampling</b>						
Sediment Sampling	LS	0	\$ 18,980.00	\$ 18,980.00	Recent similar projects	- Includes all sampling labor and expenses - Includes vibracore and IDW subcontractor costs
Sample Analysis	EA	6	\$ 1,710.63	\$ 10,263.78	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Includes analysis of full TCLP (VOCs, SVOCs, metals, herbicides, and pesticides), BTEX, PCBs, TPH, EOX, dioxins, reactivity, ignitability, and corrosivity.
<b>Site Preparation Activities</b>						
<b>Dredging</b>						
Dredge Equipment Mobilization	LS	0	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes MILCON Contractor already onsite
Dredge Personnel Mobilization	LS	0	\$ 29,180.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes MILCON Contractor already onsite
Utility Locate	LS	1	\$ 975.00	\$ 975.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes mobilization, demobilization, and all labor, equipment, and materials.
Bathymetric Survey Mobilization/Demobilization	LS	1	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes mobilization/demobilization of two-man survey crew and all associated supplies and equipment.
Pre-Removal Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects.	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
Debris Sweep	Day	1	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes equipment rented locally as needed when large debris is located
Turbidity Curtain	LF	0	\$ 28.75	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes turbidity curtain will already be onsite for SWMU 3 NTCRA
Turbidity Curtain Installation/Removal	LS	1	\$ 3,910.00	\$ 3,910.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes labor and boat for installation and removal of system
Material Staging Area Civil Construction	LS	0	\$ 175,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Sediment Offload and Screening Installation	LS	0	\$ 16,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Water Treatment System</b>						
Mobilization and Equipment Installation	LS	0	\$ 90,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA - Based on same Alternative selected for dredging SWMU 3 and SWMU 7b
<b>Dredging and Disposal</b>						
<b>Dredging</b>						
Dredging	yd <sup>3</sup>	4,281	\$ 27.25	\$ 116,657.25	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes dredging 5 days per week M-F 12 hr/day. - Includes labor, mechanical dredge use, and fuel
Work-in-Progress Bathymetric Survey	Day	2	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 8,050.00	Recent similar projects.	Bathymetric surveys will be completed following completion of each removal grid to identify need for additional dredging prior to dredge equipment downtime or demobilization. Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
Post-Removal Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects.	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day
<b>Scow Free Water Removal</b>						
Water Treatment Operations	Day	18	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 81,000.00	Recent similar projects.	Includes sump maintenance (submersible pumps, generator, mini excavator for sump cleaning), fuel, labor, and rental of frac tank, sand filter, and carbon
T&D of Water Treatment System Components	LS	0	\$ 1,250.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Water Quality Samples	EA	0	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Dewatering</b>						
Scow Slurry Pump Operation	Day	18	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 216,000.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes long reach excavator w/ root rake and all labor, equipment and materials.
Sediment Screening Operation	Day	18	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 50,400.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes screening plant, slurry pump, electrical connections, open top mix tank and all labor and equipment to operate.
Polymer Injections and Geotube Operations	Day	18	\$ 6,700.00	\$ 120,600.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes polymer injection equipment, electrical connections and labor
Geotubes	LF	310	\$ 75.00	\$ 23,250.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes cost for purchase/delivery and 15% loss of 75 ft circumference geotubes
Polymer	LB	10,300	\$ 2.00	\$ 20,600.00	Recent similar projects.	- Includes cost for purchase/delivery and 15% loss of polymer at 3lb/dry ton
<b>Solidification</b>						
Sediment Solidification	yd <sup>3</sup>	4,281	\$ 48.00	\$ 205,488.00	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes 5% by weight portland cement. Includes purchase/delivery of portland cement, equipment mobilization/demobilization, labor, and equipment
Barge Survey and Report	LS	0	\$ 7,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Sediment Transportation and Disposal</b>						
Loading	ton	6,743	\$ 4.50	\$ 30,341.59	Recent similar projects.	- Tonnage includes portland cement. Includes front end loader and excavator.
Waste Characterization Sampling	EA	5	\$ 76.70	\$ 383.50	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Assumes 1 sample 1000 yds <sup>3</sup> for analysis of TPH and paint filter test. - Includes volume of sediment and portland cement.
Transport to Landfill	Ton	6,743	\$ 9.00	\$ 60,683.18	Per quote from Waste Management Bethel Landfill	- Tonnage includes portland cement
Disposal @ Subtitle D Landfill	Ton	6,743	\$ 20.00	\$ 134,851.50	Per quote from Waste Management Bethel Landfill	- Tonnage includes portland cement
Disposal @ Subtitle D Landfill (debris)	Ton	4	\$ 50.00	\$ 200.00	Per quote from Waste Management Bethel Landfill	- Tonnage based on recent similar projects
<b>Decontamination Water Transportation and Disposal</b>						
Dredge, Scows, & Equipment Decontamination	LS	0	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Waste Characterization Sampling	EA	0	\$ 864.04	\$ -	Navy CLEAN Laboratory BOA Rates	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Transport to Disposal Facility	Load	0	\$ 665.00	\$ -	Per quote from Summit Environmental.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Disposal @ Sollex Facility, Suffolk, VA	gal	0	\$ 0.25	\$ -	Per quote from Summit Environmental.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Site Restoration/Demobilization</b>						
<b>Water Treatment System</b>						
Demobilization	LS	0	\$ 70,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
<b>Sand Layer Placement</b>						
Mobilization/Demobilization	LS	0	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	Recent similar projects.	- Assumes cost covered under the SWMU 3 NTCRA
Well Graded Sand (Washed Sand 100+)	Ton	4,654	\$ 20.00	\$ 93,081.85	Recent similar projects.	- Includes cost for purchase/delivery and 15% loss
Placement of Well Graded Sand	yd <sup>3</sup>	2,891	\$ 12.00	\$ 34,688.89	Recent similar projects.	- Includes use of sand spreader (barge and long reach excavator), fuel, and labor
<b>Site Survey</b>						
Final Bathymetric Survey	Day	1	\$ 4,025.00	\$ 4,025.00	Recent similar projects.	Assumes: - Two-man survey crew 12 hr/day - Project management 2 hr/day Conducted following completion of sand layer placement
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$1,256,480</b>			
Contingency (15%)			\$188,472			
General Conditions (10%)			\$125,648			
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$1,570,599</b>			
Performance Bond (2%)			\$31,412		Industry Average	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$1,602,011</b>			
Design Costs (8%)			\$128,161		Includes Closeout Reports	
Construction Oversight (8%)			\$128,161			
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL COST</b>			<b>\$1,858,400</b>		<b>\$2,787,600</b>	
			<b>+50%</b>		<b>\$1,300,900</b>	
			<b>-30%</b>			

- Notes**
1. Base costs used are 2012 dollars.
  2. For the bathymetric survey the dredge subcontractor will be responsible for coordinating with the surveyor to insure schedule efficiency. Navy will not be responsible for dredging delay due to surveyor. Survey will occur immediately after dredging is complete. Dredger will not leave dredging area until survey is confirmed.
  3. Assumes that 90% of the free dredge water from the scows will be removed before turnover of the scows to the offloading contractor.
  4. The enclosed Engineer's Cost Estimate based on seamless dredging operation from completion of SWMU 3 to start of SWMU 7b dredging.
  5. The enclosed Engineer's Estimate is only an estimate of possible construction costs for budgeting purposes. This estimate is limited to the conditions existing at its issuance and is not a guarantee of actual price or cost. Uncertain market conditions such as, but not limited to: local labor or contractor availability, wages, other work, material market fluctuations, price escalations, force majeure events, and developing bidding conditions etc may affect the accuracy of this estimate. CH2M Hill is not responsible for any variance from this estimate or actual prices and conditions obtained.

**Appendix D**  
**SiteWise Evaluation**

---

# Sustainability Analysis for Solid Waste Management Unit 7b – Small Boats Sandblast Yard

---

## Introduction

This appendix presents the approach taken and results obtained from a sustainability analysis that was completed for Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 7b, Small Boats Sandblast Yard at Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Alternatives are presented to address SWMU 7b contaminants of concern (COCs) in Desert Cove sediment. A detailed summary of the removal action alternatives is provided in Section 4 of the SWMU 7b Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA). A sustainability analysis was performed by CH2M HILL using SiteWise Version 2.0 (Battelle, 2011) for the following remedial alternatives:

- Alternative 1 - No action
- Alternative 2 – Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement
- Alternative 3 – Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placement
- Alternative 4 – Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement

## Method and Assumptions

The SiteWise tool (Battelle, 2011) consists of a series of Excel-based spreadsheets used to conduct a baseline assessment of sustainability metrics. The assessment is carried out using a spreadsheet-based building block approach, where every removal action alternative is first broken down into modules that mirror the phases of remedial action work, specifically (1) remedial investigation (RI), (2) remedial action construction (RAC), (3) remedial action operation (RAO), and (4) long-term monitoring (LTM).

SiteWise uses various emission factors from governmental or non-governmental research sources to determine the environmental impact of each activity. The quantitative metrics calculated by the tool include the following:

- 1) Greenhouse gases (GHGs) reported as carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e), consisting of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)
- 2) Energy usage (expressed as British Thermal Units [BTU])
- 3) Water usage (gallons of water)
- 4) Air emissions of criteria pollutants consisting of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>)
- 5) Accident risk (risk of injury and risk of fatality)

For the purpose of this discussion, the term footprint will be used to describe the quantified emissions or quantities for each metric. To estimate the sustainability footprint for each removal action alternative, only those elements of the RI, RAC, RAO, and LTM possessing important sustainability elements were included in the assessment. The No Action alternative (Alternative 1) is not analyzed because there are no impacts to environmental and social metrics. SiteWise uses a cradle-to-grave approach to quantify footprints. As a result, some activities, such as material production, incorporate environmental burdens that do not directly occur onsite, but contribute to the overall footprints of the remedial alternative. This is particularly true in the case of GHGs, which contribute on a global, long-term scale.

The major conclusions of this sustainability analysis are incorporated into the effectiveness criteria evaluation of the EE/CA report.

Detailed assumptions for removal action alternatives are provided in **Table D-1**. The following is a description of the major activities for Alternative 2. All activities for this alternative are covered under the RAC.

- RI: No actions for any alternatives.
- RAC:
  - Alternative 2 involves the dredging of 2 feet (with an additional 1-foot over-dredge) from a 0.9 acre area to 3 feet (4,281 cubic yard [yd<sup>3</sup>]) and placement of a 2-foot-thick clean sand layer. Dredge sediment will be stabilized offsite using Portland cement for offsite disposal. This alternative includes the handling of backfill material and the transportation of personnel, materials, and equipment to site. Equipment use, labor hours onsite, water use, and offsite disposal of residual waste are also included.
  - Alternative 3 involves the dredging of 2 feet (with an additional 1-foot over-dredge) from a 0.9 acre area to 3 feet (4,281 yd<sup>3</sup>) and placement of a 2-foot thick clean sand layer. Dredge sediment will be stabilized onsite using Portland cement for offsite disposal. This alternative includes the handling of backfill material and the transportation of personnel, materials, and equipment to site. Equipment use, labor hours onsite, water use, and offsite disposal of residual waste are also included.
  - Alternative 4 involves the dredging of 2 feet (with an additional 1-foot over-dredge) from a 0.9 acre area to 3 feet (4,281 yd<sup>3</sup>) and placement of a 2-foot thick clean sand layer. Dredged sediment will be placed in geotextile tubes onsite for passive dewatering and stabilized offsite using Portland cement for offsite disposal. This alternative includes the handling of backfill material and the transportation of personnel, materials, and equipment to site. Equipment use, labor hours onsite, water use, and offsite disposal of residual waste are also included.
- RAO: No actions for any alternatives.
- LTM: No actions for any alternatives.

### General Assumptions

The specific assumptions made for the individual remedies are presented in **Tables D-1** through **D-3**. The following overall assumptions are used for the SiteWise tool evaluation:

- The distances per trip for materials shipped onsite and remediation-derived waste (RDW) shipped offsite were included at full weight going one way and empty weight going one way.
- The complete environmental footprint for production of equipment used, or production of the vehicles used for transportation, is not considered in this analysis. This equipment is reusable and the burden of these removal actions in the duration of the equipments life is negligible.
- The transportation of the Portland cement, sand, and Geotube materials was captured using the Equipment Transportation section of the SiteWise tool.
- The following average distances traveled were used unless specific distances were known:
  - Oversight– 100 miles roundtrip (local workers)
  - Surveying – 100 miles roundtrip (local contractor)
  - Operators/Laborers –100 miles roundtrip (local workers)
  - Portland cement – 50 miles roundtrip
  - Sand - 50 miles roundtrip
  - Solid RDW – 12 miles (each way)
  - Aqueous RDW – 90 miles (each way)
  - Earthmoving Equipment – 50 miles roundtrip (by land)

- Sand weighs approximately 1.4 tons/yd<sup>3</sup>
- Sediment weighs approximately 1.5 tons/yd<sup>3</sup>

## Results and Conclusions

It should be noted that while this analysis quantifies the overall footprint of the alternatives, the alternatives provide different end-uses. Therefore, a comparison of the results of the alternatives needs to be made in the context of the benefits (e.g., applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement [ARAR] compliance, contaminant reduction, and cost effectiveness) of each of the alternatives. The overall comparison of alternatives is shown on **Figure D-1** and in **Table D-4**. Alternatives 2 and 3 had similarly high GHG and total energy footprints, primarily from production of Portland cement used for solidification. Alternative 4 had slightly lower GHG and total energy footprints from less Portland cement use. The footprints for the remaining impact categories (NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, water, PM<sub>10</sub>, and accident risks) were similar between the three active alternatives. Alternative 2 had a slightly lower PM<sub>10</sub> footprint and a slightly lower accident risk fatality footprint. Alternative 4 had the highest water and SO<sub>x</sub> footprints from operating the compressor for the turbidity curtain longer than Alternatives 2 and 3. Alternative 4 also had the highest accident risk footprints primarily due to the higher number of onsite labor hours.

- **Alternative 1— No Action**

This Alternative has no sustainability impacts because no action occurs; however, this alternative does not meet removal goals.

- **Alternative 2 – Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement**

The production of the Portland cement accounted for the majority of the GHG and total energy-use footprints. Handling of the sand at the distribution facility, transportation of materials and equipment and residual handling also contributed to these footprints. The water consumption footprint is from electricity used to power the compressor for the turbidity curtain (cooling water at the power plant) and the decontamination water. The NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> footprints are primarily (approximately 70 percent) from equipment use handling sediment, sand, and Portland cement. The electricity to power the compressor accounts for an additional 20 percent of the NO<sub>x</sub> footprint. Residual handling and equipment transportation accounts for the remaining PM<sub>10</sub> footprint. Approximately 60 percent of the SO<sub>x</sub> footprint is from electricity to power the compressor. The equipment use to handle sediment, sand, and Portland cement accounts for almost the entire remaining footprint of SO<sub>x</sub>. The accident risk fatality and injury footprints are primarily from the labor hours onsite, which accounted for over 70 percent of the total footprints. Personnel, equipment, and waste transportation made up the rest of the footprint. Results are provided in **Table D-5** and **Figure D-2**.

- **Alternative 3 – Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placement**

Like Alternative 2, the largest contributor to the GHG and total energy use footprints were from production of Portland cement. The water consumption footprint is primarily from the decontamination water although approximately 60 percent of the footprint is from electricity used to power the compressor for the turbidity curtain. The NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> footprints are primarily from equipment use handling sediment, sand, and Portland cement. The electricity to power the compressor accounts for an additional 20 percent of the NO<sub>x</sub> footprint. Approximately 60 percent of the SO<sub>x</sub> footprint is from electricity to power the compressor. The equipment use to handle sediment, sand, and Portland cement accounts for the remaining footprint of SO<sub>x</sub>. The accident risk fatality and injury footprints are primarily from the labor hours onsite, which accounted for over two thirds of the total footprints. Personnel, equipment, and waste transportation made up the rest of the footprints. Results are provided in **Table D-6** and **Figure D-3**.

- **Alternative 4 – Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement**

Because 50 percent less Portland cement is used in Alternative 4, the GHG and total energy footprints are lower even when accounting for the production of geotubes. Half of the water consumption footprint is from

electricity used to power the compressor for the turbidity curtain (cooling water at the power plant) and half is from the decontamination water. The majority of the NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> footprints are from equipment use handling sediment, sand, and Portland cement. The electricity to power the compressor accounts for an additional 20 percent of the NO<sub>x</sub> footprint. The SO<sub>x</sub> footprint is approximately 75 percent from electricity to power the compressor. The equipment use to handle sediment, sand, and Portland cement accounts for the remaining footprint of SO<sub>x</sub>. The water, SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> and accident risk footprints are highest for Alternative 4 primarily because of the longer duration of the field work (running the compressor longer and more hours worked). Transportation of waste and equipment, and onsite labor hours accounted for the accident risk footprints. Results are provided in **Table D-7** and **Figure D-4**.

## Uncertainty Assessment

The SiteWise tool estimates environmental and risk footprints based on industry averages, published emissions factors, and generalized data sources. The footprint results are not representative of actual emissions and should be used for comparative purposes only.

High density polyethylene (HDPE) liner was used as a proxy for the geotextile material used for the Geotubes.

## Recommendations

Depending on local and state regulations as well as client preference, each of these impact categories may be given a different “weight” or importance and the alternative with the lowest overall sustainability footprint (i.e. minimizes the footprint of the “important” criteria) may be selected. It should also be noted that while this analysis compares the environmental footprints of each of the alternatives, the alternatives provide different end-uses. Therefore, a comparison of the results of the alternatives needs to be made in the context of the benefits (for example, ARAR compliance, contaminant reduction, and cost effectiveness) of each of the alternatives.

The estimates from the SiteWise tool were used to estimate the environmental footprint of the alternatives. Once the alternative is selected, it is recommended the footprint of the selected alternative be further evaluated in the design/work planning phase of the project to explore opportunities to optimize the environmental footprint of the project and integrate sustainable remediation best practices in the design, construction, and operation of the alternative.

## References

Battelle. 2011. *SiteWise™ Version 2 User Guide*. NAVFAC Engineering Service Center, UG-2092-ENV. June.

TABLE D-1

SiteWide Results Alternative 2 - Mechanical Dredging, Upland Disposal, and Sand Layer Placement

***SWMU 7b EE/CA, JEB Little Creek, Virginia***

Assumptions:

Sediment weighs 1.5 tons/cy

Sand weighs 1.4 tons/cy

Total volume of sediment removed is 4,281 cy

SITWISE TAB	Assumptions
<b>Remedial Investigation</b>	No Actions
<b>Remedial Action Construction</b>	mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement
Material Production	Sand, 2,854 cy x 1.4 ton/cy = 3,996 tons (7,991,200 lbs)
	Portland cement (10 percent by weight for stabilization), 642 tons (1,284,300 lbs)
Personnel Transportation - Road	Oversight (PM, QA/QC, and H&S), 100 miles r/t, 3 people
	4 operator/laborers, 100 miles r/t
	Surveyors, 2 people, 1 truck, 100 miles r/t
Equipment Transportation - Road	(2) Excavators, 50 miles r/t, 30 tons
	Transport 642 tons of portland cement, 25 miles empty, 25 miles full, 16 trips (400 miles full/empty), 40 tons full load
	Transport 3,996 tons of sand, local supplier, 25 miles empty, 25 miles full, 100 trips (2,500 miles full/empty) with 40 tons full
Equipment Transportation - Water	Transport 6,421 tons dredged/dewatered soil 80 miles
Equipment Use	Excavator moving sediment from scow to trucks for disposal, 4,281 cy
	Excavator mixing portland cement into dredged sediment, 4,281 cy
	Excavator moving sand from truck to water, 2,854 cy
Equipment use - Pump	Turbidity curtain: 275 hp compressor running 5 hrs/day for 12 days (60 hrs)
Residual Handling/Fill Material Transport	7,062 tons of stabilized sediment transported by truck, 12 miles full and 12 miles empty, (177 trips of 40 tons full)
	5,000 gallons of rinse water, transported by truck, 90 miles full and 90 miles empty, 1 trip of 21 tons full
Labor Hours Onsite	1,128 hrs (4 laborers/operators, 3 oversight crew, 12 hrs/day, 12 days=1,008 hours) (2 surveyors, 12 hrs/day, 5 days = 120 hours)
Water Consumption	5,000 gallons for decon
<b>Remedial Action Operations</b>	No Actions
<b>Longterm Monitoring</b>	No Actions

Notes:

cy = cubic yards

ft = feet

H&S = health and safety

hrs = hours

hp = horsepower

lbs = pounds

PM = project management

QA/QC = quality assurance/quality control

r/t = round trip

TABLE D-2

SiteWise Results Alternative 3 - Mechanical Dredging, Onsite Solidification, Upland Disposal, and Sand Layer Placement

***SWMU 7b EE/CA, JEB Little Creek, Virginia***

Assumptions:

Sediment weighs 1.5 tons/cy

Sand weighs 1.4 tons/cy

Total volume of sediment removed is 4,281 cy

<b>SITWISE TAB</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>Remedial Investigation</b>	No Actions
<b>Remedial Action Construction</b>	mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placement
Material Production	Sand, 2,854 cy x 1.4 ton/cy = 3,996 tons (7,991,200 lbs) Portland cement (10 percent by weight for stabilization), 642 tons (1,284,300 lbs)
Personnel Transportation - Road	Oversight (PM, QA/QC, and H&S), 100 miles r/t, 3 people 4 operator/laborers, 100 miles r/t Surveyors, 2 people, 1 truck, 100 miles r/t
Equipment Transportation - Road	(2) Excavators, 50 miles r/t, 30 tons Transport 642 tons of portland cement, 25 miles empty, 25 miles full, 16 trips (400 miles full/empty), 40 tons full load Transport 3,996 tons of sand, local supplier, 25 miles empty, 25 miles full, 100 trips (2,500 miles full/empty) with 40 tons full
Equipment Use	Excavator moving sediment from scow to trucks for disposal, 4,281 cy Excavator mixing portland cement into dredged sediment, 4,281 cy Excavator moving sand from truck to water, 2,854 cy
Equipment use - Pump	Turbidity curtain: 275 hp compressor running 5 hrs/day for 12 days (60 hrs)
Residual Handling/Fill Material Transport	7,062 tons of stabilized sediment transported by truck, 30 miles full and 30 miles empty, (177 trips of 40 tons full) 10,000 gallons of rinse water, transported by truck, 90 miles full and 90 miles empty, 2 trips of 21 tons full
Labor Hours Onsite	1,128 hrs (4 laborers/operators, 3 oversight crew, 12 hrs/day, 12 days=1,008 hrs) (2 surveyors, 12 hrs/day, 5 days = 120 hrs)
Resource Consumption - Water use	10,000 gallons for decon, disposed of offsite
<b>Remedial Action Operations</b>	No Actions
<b>Longterm Monitoring</b>	No Actions

Notes:

cy = cubic yards

ft = feet

H&S = health and safety

hrs = hours

hp = horsepower

lbs = pounds

PM = project management

QA/QC = quality assurance/quality control

r/t = round trip

TABLE D-3

SiteWise Results Alternative 4 - Mechanical Dredging, Onsite Passive Dewatering via Geotube, Upland Disposal, and Sand Layer Placement

**SWMU 7b EE/CA, JEB Little Creek, Virginia**

Assumptions:

Sand weighs 1.4 tons/cy

Total volume of sediment removed is 4,281 cy

Sediment weighs 1.5 tons/cy

SITEWISE TAB	Assumptions
<b>Remedial Investigation</b>	No Actions
<b>Remedial Action Construction</b>	mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement
Material Production	Sand, 2,854 cy x 1.4 ton/cy = 3,996 tons (7,991,200 lbs)
	Geotube material (proxy 10 mil HDPE liner for the geotextile material) area of material = 2,250 square yards (20,250 square ft) (270 ft of 75 ft circumference geotubes)
	Portland cement (5 percent by weight for stabilization), 321 tons (642,000 lbs)
Personnel Transportation - Road	Oversight (PM, QA/QC, and H&S), 100 miles r/t, 3 people
	4 operator/laborers, 100 miles r/t
	Surveyors, 2 people, 1 truck, 100 miles r/t
Equipment Transportation - Road	(2) Excavators, 50 miles r/t, 30 tons
	Geotube materials = weight approximately 33 oz per square yard (manufacturer specifications) = 2,250 x 33 oz /16 oz/lb = 4,218 lb or 2.1 tons, transported 500 miles from Georgia, empty return
	Transport 3,996 tons of sand, local supplier, 25 miles empty, 25 miles full, 100 trips (2,500 miles full/empty) with 40 tons full
Equipment Use	Transport 321 tons of portland cement, 25 miles empty, 25 miles full, 8 trips (200 miles full/empty), 40 tons full load
	Excavator moving sediment from geotube to trucks for disposal, 4,281 cy
	Excavator mixing cement into sediment for stabilization, 4,281 cy
Equipment use - Pump	Excavator moving sand to water, 2,854 cy
Equipment use - Pump	275 hp compressor running 5 hs/day for 18 days (90 hrs)
Residual Handling/Fill Material Transport	6,742 tons of stabilized sediment transported by truck, 30 miles full and 30 miles empty, (169 trips of 40 tons full)
	10,000 gallons of rinse water, transported by truck, 90 miles full and 90 miles empty, 2 trips of 21 tons full
Labor Hours Onsite	1,632 hrs (4 laborers/operators, 3 oversight crew, 12 hrs/day, 18 days=1,512 hours) (2 surveyors, 12 hrs/day, 5 days = 120 hours)
Resource Consumption - Water use	10,000 gallons for decon, disposed of offsite
<b>Remedial Action Operations</b>	No Actions
<b>Longterm Monitoring</b>	No Actions

Notes:

cy = cubic yards

ft = feet

H&S = health and safety

hp = horsepower

hrs = hours

lbs = pounds

PM = project management

oz = ounce

QA/QC = quality assurance/quality control

r/t = round trip

TABLE D-4

Relative Impact of Alternatives

*SWMU 7b EE/CA, JEB Little Creek, Virginia*

Remedial Alternatives	GHG Emissions	Total energy Used	Water Used	NO <sub>x</sub> emissions	SO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	PM10 Emissions	Accident Risk Fatality	Accident Risk Injury
	metric ton	MMBTU	gallons	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton		
Alternative 1- No Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alternative 2 - Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement	5.63E+02	3.64E+03	1.13E+04	5.33E-02	4.29E-02	3.81E-03	1.98E-04	3.48E-02
Alternative 3 - Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placement	5.53E+02	3.62E+03	1.63E+04	5.80E-02	4.30E-02	4.23E-03	2.49E-04	3.89E-02
Alternative 4 - Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via Geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement	3.16E+02	2.45E+03	1.94E+04	6.23E-02	5.94E-02	4.21E-03	2.96E-04	5.05E-02

Remedial Alternatives	GHG Emissions	Total energy Used	Water Used	NO <sub>x</sub> emissions	SO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	PM10 Emissions	Accident Risk Fatality	Accident Risk Injury
	metric ton	MMBTU	gallons	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton		
Alternative 1- No Action	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Alternative 2 - Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement	High	High	Medium	High	High	High	Medium	Medium
Alternative 3 - Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placement	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
Alternative 4 - Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via Geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	High	High	High

The relative impact is a qualitative assessment of the relative footprint of each alternative, a rating of High for an alternative is assigned if it is at least 70 percent of the maximum footprint, a rating of Medium is assigned if it is between 30 and 70 percent of the maximum footprint, and a rating of Low is assigned if it is less than 30 percent of the maximum footprint.

Notes:

GHG - Greenhouse Gases

MMBTU - million British Thermal Unit

NO<sub>x</sub> - Nitrogen Oxides

PM10 - Particulate Matter

SO<sub>x</sub> - Sulfur Oxides

TABLE D-5

SiteWise Results Alternative 2 - Mechanical Dredging, Upland Disposal, and Sand Layer Placement

*SWMU 7b EE/CA, JEB Little Creek, Virginia*

Phase	Activities	GHG Emissions	Total Energy Used	Water Used	NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	SO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions	Accident Risk Fatality	Accident Risk Injury
		metric ton	MMBTU	gallons	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton		
Remedial Action Construction	Consumables	5.02E+02	2.88E+03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Transportation-Personnel	2.29E-01	2.88E+00	NA	8.46E-05	2.98E-06	1.72E-05	7.02E-06	5.65E-04
	Transportation-Equipment	3.84E+01	3.90E+02	NA	4.23E-03	7.48E-05	3.76E-04	4.60E-05	3.70E-03
	Equipment Use and Misc	1.32E+01	2.30E+02	1.13E+04	4.59E-02	4.28E-02	3.14E-03	1.10E-04	2.77E-02
	Residual Handling	9.98E+00	1.30E+02	NA	3.14E-03	5.55E-05	2.79E-04	3.45E-05	2.78E-03
	Sub-Total	5.63E+02	3.64E+03	1.13E+04	5.33E-02	4.29E-02	3.81E-03	1.98E-04	3.48E-02
<b>Total</b>		<b>5.63E+02</b>	<b>3.64E+03</b>	<b>1.13E+04</b>	<b>5.33E-02</b>	<b>4.29E-02</b>	<b>3.81E-03</b>	<b>1.98E-04</b>	<b>3.48E-02</b>

Notes:

GHG - Greenhouse Gases

MMBTU - million British Thermal Unit

NA - Not Applicable

NO<sub>x</sub> - Nitrogen OxidesPM<sub>10</sub> - Particulate MatterSO<sub>x</sub> - Sulfur Oxides

TABLE D-6

SiteWise Results Alternative 3 - Mechanical Dredging, Onsite Solidification, Upland Disposal, and Sand Layer Placement

***SWMU 7b EE/CA, JEB Little Creek, Virginia***

Phase	Activities	GHG Emissions	Total Energy Used	Water Used	NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	SO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions	Accident Risk Fatality	Accident Risk Injury
		metric ton	MMBTU	gallons	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton		
Remedial Action Construction	Consumables	5.02E+02	2.88E+03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Transportation-Personnel	2.29E-01	2.88E+00	NA	8.46E-05	2.98E-06	1.72E-05	7.02E-06	5.65E-04
	Transportation-Equipment	1.35E+01	1.76E+02	NA	4.23E-03	7.48E-05	3.76E-04	4.60E-05	3.70E-03
	Equipment Use and Misc	1.32E+01	2.30E+02	1.63E+04	4.59E-02	4.28E-02	3.14E-03	1.10E-04	2.77E-02
	Residual Handling	2.48E+01	3.24E+02	NA	7.80E-03	1.38E-04	6.93E-04	8.56E-05	6.89E-03
	Sub-Total	5.53E+02	3.62E+03	1.63E+04	5.80E-02	4.30E-02	4.23E-03	2.49E-04	3.89E-02
<b>Total</b>		<b>5.53E+02</b>	<b>3.62E+03</b>	<b>1.63E+04</b>	<b>5.80E-02</b>	<b>4.30E-02</b>	<b>4.23E-03</b>	<b>2.49E-04</b>	<b>3.89E-02</b>

Notes:

GHG - Greenhouse Gases

MMBTU - million British Thermal Unit

NA - Not Applicable

NO<sub>x</sub> - Nitrogen Oxides

PM<sub>10</sub> - Particulate Matter

SO<sub>x</sub> - Sulfur Oxides

TABLE D-7

SiteWise Results Alternative 4 - Mechanical Dredging, Onsite Passive Dewatering via Geotube, Upland Disposal, and Sand Layer Placement

*SWMU 7b EE/CA, JEB Little Creek, Virginia*

Phase	Activities	GHG Emissions	Total Energy Used	Water Used	NO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	SO <sub>x</sub> Emissions	PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions	Accident Risk Fatality	Accident Risk Injury
		metric ton	MMBTU	gallons	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton		
Remedial Action Construction	Consumables	2.61E+02	1.66E+03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Transportation-Personnel	2.29E-01	2.88E+00	NA	8.46E-05	2.98E-06	1.72E-05	7.02E-06	5.65E-04
	Transportation-Equipment	1.40E+01	1.82E+02	NA	4.39E-03	7.77E-05	3.90E-04	5.07E-05	4.08E-03
	Equipment Use and Misc	1.66E+01	2.94E+02	1.94E+04	5.03E-02	5.92E-02	3.14E-03	1.56E-04	3.93E-02
	Residual Handling	2.37E+01	3.09E+02	NA	7.45E-03	1.32E-04	6.63E-04	8.19E-05	6.59E-03
	Sub-Total	3.16E+02	2.45E+03	1.94E+04	6.23E-02	5.94E-02	4.21E-03	2.96E-04	5.05E-02
<b>Total</b>		<b>3.16E+02</b>	<b>2.45E+03</b>	<b>1.94E+04</b>	<b>6.23E-02</b>	<b>5.94E-02</b>	<b>4.21E-03</b>	<b>2.96E-04</b>	<b>5.05E-02</b>

Notes:

GHG - Greenhouse Gases


MMBTU - million British Thermal Unit

NA - Not Applicable

NO<sub>x</sub> - Nitrogen Oxides

PM<sub>10</sub> - Particulate Matter

SO<sub>x</sub> - Sulfur Oxides



**Notes:**

Alternative 2 - Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement

Alternative 3 - Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placment

Alternative 4 - Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement

Figure D-1  
 Overall Summary  
 SWMU 7b EE/CA  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia










Figure D-2  
Alternative 2 - Mechanical dredging, upland disposal, and sand layer placement  
SWMU 7b EE/CA  
JEB Little Creek  
Virginia Beach, Virginia











Figure D-3  
 Alternative 3 - Mechanical dredging, onsite solidification, upland disposal, and sand layer placement  
 SWMU 7b EE/CA  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia











Figure D-4  
 Alternative 4 - Mechanical dredging, onsite passive dewatering via geotube, upland disposal, and sand layer placement  
 SWMU 7b EE/CA  
 JEB Little Creek  
 Virginia Beach, Virginia

**Attachment B**  
**Public Notice and Responsiveness Summary**

---

INTERACTIVE MEDIA  
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA  
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

Online Publication VP

CH2M HILL  
5700 CLEVELAND ST  
SUITE 101  
VIRGINIA BEACH VA 23462

REFERENCE: 39205016  
23364032 JEBLC SWMU 7b EE/CA

Commonwealth of Virginia  
City of Norfolk

This day, Lisa Cook personally appeared before me  
and, after being duly sworn, make oath that:

1. She is affidavit clerk of Interactive  
Media, a subsidiary of The Virginian-Pilot Media  
Companies, LLC, publishing in Chesapeake, Suffolk,  
Norfolk, Portsmouth and Virginia Beach,  
Commonwealth of Virginia in the state of Virginia

2. The advertisement has been produced on the  
said site on the date stated



PUBLISHED ON: 12/13

TOTAL COST: 35.00 AD SPACE: 112 LINE  
FILED ON: 12/14/12

Legal Affiant: *Lisa Cook*

Subscribed and sworn to before me in my city and state on the day and year  
aforesaid this 18 day of December 2012. (NRN: 7145124)

Notary: *Francisco A. Kelly* My commission expires October 31, 2015.

THE VIRGINIAN-PILOT  
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA  
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

The Virginian-Pilot

CH2M HILL  
5700 CLEVELAND ST  
SUITE 101  
VIRGINIA BEACH VA 23462

REFERENCE: 39205016  
23364032 JEBLC SWMU 7b EE/CA

State of Virginia  
City of Norfolk

This day, Jacqueline Whitfield appeared before me and, after being duly sworn, made oath that: 1) she is affidavit clerk of the Virginian-Pilot, a newspaper published by The Virginian-Pilot Media Companies, LLC, in the cities of Norfolk, Portsmouth, Chesapeake, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach, Commonwealth of Virginia and in the state of North Carolina 2.) That the advertisement hereto annexed has been published in said newspaper on the dates stated



PUBLISHED ON: 12/13

TOTAL COST: 854.56 AD SPACE: 112 LINE  
FILED ON: 12/14/12

Legal Affiant Jacqueline Whitfield

Subscribed and sworn to before me in my city and state on the day and year aforesaid this 18 of December in the year of 2012. (NRN:7145124)

Notary: Francisco A. Kelly My commission expires October 31, 2015.



**Public Notice of  
Navy's Invitation for Public Comment on the Engineering  
Evaluation/Cost Analysis for Solid Waste Management Unit 7b -  
Small Boats Sandblast Yard  
at Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek**

The Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC), Mid-Atlantic, invites the public to provide comments on the proposed removal action at Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 7b at Joint Expeditionary Base (JEB) Little Creek, Virginia Beach, Virginia. The removal action, consisting of the removal of approximately 4,300 cubic yards of impacted sediment, is detailed in the Draft Final Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) report. The document will be available for public review at the following location:

**Virginia Beach Central Library  
4100 Virginia Beach Blvd  
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23452  
(757) 431-3001**

The public is invited to provide written comments on the EE/CA during the period of December 13, 2012 through January 13, 2013. Send all written comments postmarked on or before January 13, 2013 to the following address:

NAVFAC MID ATLANTIC  
Building N-26, Rm 3300  
ATTN: Bryan Peed  
9742 Maryland Avenue  
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-3095  
Bryan.Peed@navy.mil  
Phone: 757-341-0480

If requested, a public meeting will be held by representatives of the Navy to clarify public questions or comments on the EE/CA.

VP December 13, 2012 23364032