New Jersey Zinc / Mobil Chemical NPL Site Questions and Answers from June 23, 2011 Site Tour

During the site tour for elected officials and their staff on June 23, a number of questions were raised. The table below contains a list of these questions and a response from Illinois EPA.

| Question | Response |
|--|--|
| Is the water discharge from the | CERCLA Section 121(e) provides an |
| phosphogypsum stack subject to a National | exemption to obtaining permits for |
| Pollutant Discharge Elimination System | activities that are conducted entirely on- |
| (NPDES) Permit? | site. However, the responsible parties must |
| /- | meet the substantive requirements of the |
| | permit, even though no actual permit is |
| | issued. At the phosphogypsum stack, |
| | NPDES permit IL0032182 had been |
| | assigned to ExxonMobil, but was |
| | discontinued after the New Jersey Zinc site |
| | was listed on the National Priorities List |
| | (Superfund). ExxonMobil continues to |
| | monitor the former permit's outfalls in the |
| | same manner as when the permit was in |
| | effect. A monthly report is submitted to |
| | Illinois EPA providing analytical results of |
| | the samples taken. In the rare case when |
| | exceedances have been detected, |
| | ExxonMobil has reported them, taken |
| | action to determine the cause, and |
| | corrected the situation. |
| Has an aquatic life study been done in the | The Clearwater Pond and treatment |
| Clearwater Pond and treatment wetlands? | wetlands have not been studied to evaluate |
| | the presence of aquatic life. Both features |
| | function as major components of the water |
| | control and treatment system for the |
| | phosphogypsum stack. There are no |
| | regulations that require such features to be |
| | monitored for their ability to sustain |
| How one the amoundwister seems seems 1, 10 | aquatic life. |
| How are the groundwater seeps sampled? | Water and sediment samples from the seeps |
| Are there analytical data? | were collected and analyzed in the |
| | laboratory for concentrations of chemicals of concern. The results can be found in the |
| | DePue Lake Remedial Investigation Report |
| | (Arcadis, July 2009). Additional water |
| | samples have been collected over the last |
| | year as part of the groundwater study for |
| | the former plant area. Analytical data have |
| | the former plant area. Allarytical data flave |

| | been included in the remedial investigation report for the lake and will be included in the investigation report for the plant area. Some data are available through the information repository at the Selby Township Library. |
|---|---|
| How much metal contamination does the water treatment plant remove each month? | The amount of metal contamination removed from treated water varies with the volume of groundwater and surface water that are treated each month. In May 2011, 19,913 pounds of zinc, 952 pounds of manganese, and 924 pounds of copper were removed from the water. |
| How much sludge is produced by the water treatment plant each month? | As with the volume of treated water, the amount of sludge produced will vary each month. In May 2011, 224,520 pounds of sludge was produced by the treatment process. |
| How does the amount of metals removed from the water at DePue compare with similar sites in Illinois? | The New Jersey Zinc site is the only metals smelter site in Illinois where water treatment is currently being conducted, so Illinois EPA has no basis for comparison. |
| What is the status of the risk assessments? | Risk assessments have been conducted only for operable unit 5, DePue Lake, so far. The human health risk assessment has been through two rounds of comment/response and responses to Illinois EPA's initial comments are under review by the Agency. Illinois EPA has received comments from Northwestern University on behalf of the Village and is reviewing them. |
| Is the IDNR dredge disposal area leaching into the lake? | According to a study completed by the Illinois State Water Survey and Illinois State Geological Survey (Wehrmann, et. al. 2007), metals present in the dredged soil have leached into the groundwater; however, contaminated groundwater has not yet moved off-site. As the report concludes, "There has been sufficient time since dredging (~20 years) for the metals to have migrated to the wells just outside the [Dredged Soil Disposal Area], a distance of less than 50 feet, if they had been even partially mobilized." The report cautions that off-site migration could occur, due to |

| | observed downward movement and |
|--|--|
| | unusual geochemical conditions (e.g., |
| | frequent flooding), given enough time. |
| What is the impact of flooding on the | Flooding brings in large volumes of water |
| migration of contamination? | that can dilute existing contamination or |
| | add new contaminants to the receiving |
| | water body. Flooding also brings in |
| | sediment from other sources that eventually |
| | settle on top of existing sediment. |
| From what depth were the sediment | Sediment samples were collected from |
| samples collected? | throughout the lake and to depths up to 16 |
| 1 | feet. The sediment samples used for risk |
| | assessment were from 0-2 feet because this |
| | is the depth interval to which people are |
| | exposed. The deeper sediment samples |
| | will be used to help with decision making |
| | later in the remedial process. |
| What contaminants were present in the | The same metals found in the surface |
| deeper sediment samples? | sediments were found in deeper sediments. |
| deeper sediment samples: | Some metals exhibited concentrations that |
| | |
| | did not vary much from the surface while others showed increases in concentrations |
| | |
| | with increasing depth to about 6 to 10 feet, |
| | and then decreased with depth below 10 |
| | feet. The depth of increases in |
| | concentration (considered to be above |
| | background) generally corresponds to the |
| | lake bottom as it occurred in 1904, at the |
| | beginning of plant operations. Many |
| | sediment samples exhibited their highest |
| | concentrations at the 2-4 foot depth |
| | interval, particularly those taken in the |
| | previously dredged area. |
| Was it reasonable to use Goose Lake as a | Yes. Goose Lake was chosen for its |
| comparison for the risk assessments? | similar characteristics to DePue Lake. |
| Goose Lake is downstream of DePue Lake | Data gathered by the ISGS and ISWS |
| and therefore receiving contaminants from | indicate that Goose Lake is similar in |
| the New Jersey Zinc / Mobil Chemical site. | chemical concentrations to most other |
| - | backwater lakes in the Peoria Pool, both |
| | upstream and downstream of DePue Lake, |
| | and the source for much of this |
| | contamination is historical discharges from |
| | point sources to the Upper Illinois River. |
| | r sources to the opport minors raver. |

| Was swimming considered in the human health risk assessment? | No. Nevertheless, to assure that this potential future use is considered, the Illinois EPA will ask the DePue Group to evaluate swimming as a potential future |
|--|--|
| If funding was found for dredging, how could it be tied into the environmental dredging of the lake? | This question would need to be explored during the remedial design stage of the lake remediation. If additional funding were found for dredging of lake sediments that would not need to be removed as part of the Superfund cleanup, mobilization costs could be saved by conducting this dredging immediately after the environmental dredging. The problem of sediment disposal would remain, because the Illinois River deposits 28.6 acre-feet of sediment (a one-acre stack of sediment, piled 28.6 feet high) into DePue Lake each year (Cahill & Bogner 2002). |
| Could dredging of the entire lake be required in a revised consent order? | Only if the DePue Group (the responsible parties) agreed. A revised consent order pertaining to the Superfund cleanup would address only those actions necessary to protect human health and the environment from contaminants associated with site operations. Under Superfund law, neither the State nor USEPA can compel the PRPs to take any action beyond what is necessary to eliminate unacceptable risk. |

References:

<u>An Assessment of Metals Distribution and Transport in Groundwater Beneath the Diked Sediment Disposal Area, DePue Wildlife Management Area, Illinois</u> / RR-110 Wehrmann, H. Allen; Kelley, Walton R.; Holm, Thomas R.; Carr, Keith. -- Champaign, IL: Illinois Waste Management and Research Center, 2007.

Cahill, R.A., Bogner, W.C. 2002. Investigation of Metal Distributions and Sedimentation Patterns in Lake DePue and Turner Lake. Waste Management and Research Center Research Report Series, No. 98. Champaign, IL)

ARCADIS 2009. DePue Lake Remedial Investigation Report, Volume I of II, Chicago, Illinois. July.