



Department of Environmental Conservation

**Division of Environmental Remediation**

---

**Environmental Restoration  
Record of Decision  
South Troy Industrial Park Site**

**Rensselaer County, New York  
Site Number B00163**

---

**March 2006**

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
GEORGE E. PATAKI, *Governor*      DENISE M. SHEEHAN, *Commissioner*

**DECLARATION STATEMENT**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION RECORD OF DECISION**

---

**South Troy Industrial Park Environmental Restoration Site**  
**Rensselaer County, New York**  
**Site No. B00163**  
**March 2006**

**Statement of Purpose and Basis**

The Record of Decision (ROD) presents the selected remedy for the South Troy Industrial Park site, an environmental restoration site. The selected remedial program was chosen in accordance with the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and is not inconsistent with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan of March 8, 1990 (40CFR300), as amended.

This decision is based on the Administrative Record of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) for the South Troy Industrial Park environmental restoration site, and the public's input to the Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) presented by the NYSDEC. A listing of the documents included as a part of the Administrative Record is included in Appendix B of the ROD.

**Assessment of the Site**

Actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances and petroleum products from this site, if not addressed by implementing the response action selected in this ROD, presents a current or potential significant threat to public health and/or the environment.

**Description of Selected Remedy**

Based on the results of the Site Investigation/Remedial Alternatives Report (SI/RAR) for the South Troy Industrial Park site and the criteria identified for evaluation of alternatives, the NYSDEC has selected a soil cover with soil and groundwater treatment as the remedy for the site. The components of the remedy are as follows:

- Placement of a minimum 12-inch clean soil cover over the site. The soil cover would be underlain by a warning layer to identify the presence of potentially contaminated fill beneath it and to provide a physical barrier against unintended penetration. For portions of the site where a restricted residential use may occur, the clean soil cover will be a minimum of 24 inches. Site development elements such as buildings and pavement may be substituted for the 12-inch or 24-inch soil cover.

- Treatment of soil and groundwater in the area of the site where a buried tank and drums were removed.
- Excavation and off-site disposal of abandoned petroleum pipelines that cross a portion of the site. The pipes would be capped at the ends where they enter the site.
- Development of a site management plan to address residual contamination and any use restrictions. The site management plan would also require an evaluation of the potential for vapor intrusion in any buildings to be developed on the site.
- Imposition of environmental easements on all parcels that comprise the site.
- Periodic certification of the institutional and engineering controls.
- Long term groundwater monitoring

**New York State Department of Health Acceptance**


The New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) concurs that the remedy selected for this site is protective of human health.

**Declaration**

The selected remedy is protective of human health and the environment, complies with State and Federal requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedial action to the extent practicable, and is cost effective.

MAR 31 2006

Date



Dale A. Desnoyers, Director  
Division of Environmental Remediation

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1: SUMMARY OF THE RECORD OF DECISION .....	1
2: SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION .....	2
3: SITE HISTORY .....	3
3.1: Operational/Disposal History .....	3
3.2: Remedial History .....	3
4: ENFORCEMENT STATUS .....	4
5: SITE CONTAMINATION .....	4
5.1: Summary of the Site Investigation .....	4
5.2: Interim Remedial Measures .....	9
5.3: Summary of Human Exposure Pathways .....	10
5.4: Summary of Environmental Impacts .....	12
6: SUMMARY OF THE REMEDIATION GOALS AND PROPOSED USE OF THE SITE .	12
7: SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES .....	13
7.1: Description of Remedial Alternatives .....	13
7.2: Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives .....	18
8: SUMMARY OF THE SELECTED REMEDY .....	19
Tables	
- Table 1: Nature and Extent of Contamination .....	23
- Table 2: Remedial Alternative Costs .....	30
Figures	
- Figure 1: Site Location Map	
- Figure 2: Areas of Concern	
- Figure 3: Site-Wide Thickness of Fill Contour Map	
- Figure 4: Parcel 2 Shallow Groundwater Contour Map	
- Figure 5: Remedial Measures Locations Map	
Appendices	
- Appendix A: Responsiveness Summary .....	A-1
- Appendix B: Administrative Record .....	B-1

# **Environmental Restoration RECORD OF DECISION**

**South Troy Industrial Park Site  
Rensselaer County New York  
Site No. B00163  
March 2006**

---

## **SECTION 1: SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PLAN**

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), has selected a remedy for the South Troy Industrial Park. The presence of hazardous substances has created threats to human health and/or the environment that are addressed by this remedy.

The 1996 Clean Water/ Clean Air Bond Act provides funding to municipalities for the investigation and cleanup of brownfields. Under the Environmental Restoration Program, the State provides grants to municipalities to reimburse up to 90 percent of eligible costs for site investigation and remediation activities. Once remediated, the property can then be reused.

As more fully described in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, historical iron and steel production, petroleum releases and illegal dumping have resulted in the disposal of hazardous substances, including metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). These hazardous substances have contaminated the soil, fill and groundwater at the site, and have resulted in:

- a threat to human health associated with potential exposure to soil, fill, groundwater, and soil vapors,
- an environmental threat associated with the impacts of contaminants to groundwater.

To eliminate or mitigate these threats, the NYSDEC has selected the following remedy to allow for commercial, industrial and passive recreational use of the site. The remedy includes a provision for possible restricted residential use of the site as a correctional facility. Passive recreational use includes golf courses, bike or walking paths, tennis courts, green space or other public uses with limited potential for soil contact.

- A remedial design program to provide the details necessary to implement the remedial program.
- Placement of a minimum 12-inch clean soil cover over the site. The soil cover will be underlain by a warning layer to identify the presence of potentially contaminated fill beneath it and to provide a physical barrier against unintended penetration. For portions of the site where a restricted residential use may occur, the clean soil cover will be a minimum

of 24 inches. In all cases, site development elements which effectively prevent contact with contaminated soil (i.e., buildings and pavement) may be substituted for the 12-inch or 24-inch soil cover.

- Treatment of soil and groundwater in the area of the site where a buried tank and drums were removed.
- Excavation and off-site disposal of abandoned petroleum pipelines that cross a portion of the site. The pipes will be capped at the ends where they enter the site.
- Development of a site management plan to address residual contamination and any use restrictions. The site management plan will also require an evaluation of the potential for vapor intrusion in any buildings to be developed on the site.
- Imposition of environmental easements on all parcels that comprise the site.
- Periodic certification of the institutional and engineering controls.
- Long term groundwater monitoring

The selected remedy, discussed in detail in Section 8, is intended to attain the remediation goals identified for this site in Section 6. The remedy must conform with officially promulgated standards and criteria that are directly applicable, or that are relevant and appropriate. The selection of a remedy must also take into consideration guidance, as appropriate. Standards, criteria and guidance are hereafter called SCGs.

## **SECTION 2: SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

The South Troy Industrial Park comprises three separate parcels of undeveloped land located along East Industrial Parkway in the City of Troy, Rensselaer County (see Figures 1 and 2). These parcels are generally bounded to the east by the Conrail railroad tracks and to the west by the Hudson River. The combined acreage of these parcels is 20.98 acres, of which Parcel 1, the northernmost parcel, comprises 16.96 acres. The site is owned by the Rensselaer County Industrial Development Agency (IDA).

Land use in this area is industrial and institutional, with residential properties and an elementary school on the opposite side of the railroad tracks. Properties adjoining the three parcels include Troy Slag Products, New Penn Trucking, Capital Cleaners, the Hudson-Mohawk Industrial Gateway Museum, the Rensselaer County Jail, the City of Troy Department of Public Works, Callanan Industries and the former Sperry Warehouse. The New Penn Trucking facility, which is adjacent to Parcel 1, was the subject of a completed remediation under the DEC's Voluntary Cleanup Program. The site is approximately one-half mile north of the Niagara Mohawk Water Street site, a former manufactured gas plant site where remediation activities have also been performed.

## **SECTION 3: SITE HISTORY**

### **3.1: Operational/Disposal History**

The site was used as farmland until 1862, when it began to be developed as the Lower Works of the Burden Iron Works. The site was originally a low-lying element of the Hudson River flood plain, and was filled with iron manufacturing wastes to raise its elevation. These wastes included slag, ash and cinders, as well as rubble from building demolition and structure fires in the City of Troy. The depth of this fill ranges from 2 feet in eastern portions of the site, to 30 feet along the Hudson River.

Historical documents indicate that Parcel 1 was used primarily for waste slag and ash disposal, along with the storage of iron ore and coal offloaded from barges. Parcel 2 primarily contained the rolling mill, but also at least one small gas producer house, which may be associated with manufactured gas plant wastes. A second small gas producer house was historically present along the boundary of Parcel 2 and the former Sperry Warehouse. Beginning in the 1920's, iron production was phased out, and the Republic Steel Corporation began to operate the blast furnaces at the Lower Works. Republic Steel eventually acquired the site in 1940, and continued steel manufacturing until 1972.

The northeast corner of Parcel 2 is also crossed by three petroleum supply pipelines that historically delivered fuel oil from an off-site barge offloading facility to storage tanks at the adjacent property ("the Alamo"). These pipes are exposed in a concrete valve pit. Based on the steam jackets surrounding the pipes and anecdotal evidence, the pipelines are believed to have carried #6 fuel oil.

### **3.2: Remedial History**

Several investigations have been conducted at the site and neighboring properties since 1986. In 1986 a subsurface investigation was conducted to characterize geotechnical and environmental conditions beneath the site. Seventeen test borings were performed, and ten of these were converted to groundwater monitoring wells. Metals were found to exceed their cleanup guidelines in two of the wells.

In 1990 an Environmental Site Assessment was performed at the site. Four test borings, seven monitoring wells, and 35 test pits were performed at several parcels along East Industrial Parkway, including this site, and the adjacent Rensselaer County Jail and New Penn Trucking facility. During this investigation, low levels of benzene were detected on Parcel 2 and elsewhere, and field evidence of petroleum contamination was found.

Between 1999 and 2002 several investigations were performed at the New Penn Trucking facility adjacent to Parcel 1 of this site. An area of coal tar was discovered beneath the proposed building footprint which was excavated and removed from that site.

In 2002, a total of 32 test pits were performed as part of two separate investigations on the portion of Parcel 1 between New Penn Trucking and the Rensselaer County Jail to visually and chemically characterize the underlying soil and fill material. Certain metals and semivolatile organic contaminants were detected above their cleanup guidelines, but coal tar was not encountered.

## **SECTION 4: ENFORCEMENT STATUS**

Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) are those who may be legally liable for contamination at a site. This may include past owners and operators, waste generators, and haulers.

Since no viable PRPs have been identified, there are currently no ongoing enforcement actions. However, legal action may be initiated at a future date by the State to recover State response costs should PRPs be identified. The Rensselaer County IDA will assist the State in their efforts by providing all information to the state which identifies PRPs. The Rensselaer County IDA will also not enter into any agreement regarding response costs without the approval of the NYSDEC.

## **SECTION 5: SITE CONTAMINATION**

The Rensselaer County IDA has recently completed a Remedial Investigation/Alternatives Analysis Report (RI/AAR) to determine the nature and extent of contamination by hazardous substances at this environmental restoration project site.

### **5.1: Summary of the Site Investigation**

The purpose of the RI was to define the nature and extent of contamination resulting from previous activities at the site. The RI was conducted between August 2004 and October 2005. The field activities and findings of the investigation are described in the RI report.

The following activities were conducted during the RI:

- Compilation of previous sampling data;
- Excavation of seven test trenches and four test pits to characterize the nature of site fill, determine its depth profile and investigate potential source areas;
- Collection of 21 surface soil samples to evaluate the potential for human exposures;
- Installation of 28 soil borings and 13 monitoring wells for analysis of soils and groundwater as well as physical properties of soil and hydrogeologic conditions; and
- Sampling of 24 new and existing monitoring wells.

To determine whether the soil and groundwater contain contamination at levels of concern, data from the investigation were compared to the following SCGs:

- Groundwater, drinking water, and surface water SCGs are based on NYSDEC “Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values” and Part 5 of the New York State Sanitary Code.

- Soil SCGs are based on the NYSDEC “Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum (TAGM) 4046; Determination of Soil Cleanup Objectives and Cleanup Levels”.
- Background surface soil samples were taken from three locations. These locations were upgradient of the site, and were unaffected by historic or current site operations. The samples were analyzed for metals and semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs).

Based on the RI results, in comparison to the SCGs and potential public health and environmental exposure routes, certain media and areas of the site require remediation. These are summarized below. More complete information can be found in the RI report.

### **5.1.1: Site Geology and Hydrogeology**

Surficial geology in the vicinity of the site is mapped as recent alluvium deposits, consisting of fine sand to gravel, which is generally confined to floodplains within a valley. In larger valleys, the sand and gravel may be overlain by silt. Based on the findings of the RI, native soils beneath overlying fill materials consist primarily of silts with varying percentages of sand and clay over sand and gravel.

Bedrock in the vicinity of the site is mapped in the category of the Trenton Group, consisting of shale and minor mudstone and sandstone. Bedrock was not encountered during subsurface investigations conducted of the site as part of this RI. However shale bedrock was encountered during previous site investigations at depths ranging from 35 feet to 58.5 feet below ground surface.

The site is covered with fill materials to varying depths, as shown on the contour map presented in Figure 3. Under Parcel 1, native soils were encountered beneath the fill materials at depths ranging from 8 feet along the eastern boundary to 32 feet along the Hudson River. These soils are composed primarily of brown and gray silts. Groundwater was encountered during the investigation at the fill/native soil interface. Overall, the surface topography of native soils underlying Parcel 1 slopes westerly towards the Hudson River. A large pile of slag is present in the northwest corner of Parcel 1, extending off-site onto the adjacent property to the north. This 50-foot tall pile of slag is commonly referred to as “Slag Mountain”, as indicated on Figure 2. The northern and eastern faces of Slag Mountain are nearly vertical as the result of past excavation of the slag for use in road construction.

In the portion of Parcel 1 east of East Industrial Parkway, a sand and gravel water bearing unit was encountered beneath the native silt layer at certain locations. Groundwater encountered above the silt layer is referred to as shallow groundwater while groundwater encountered in the underlying sand and gravel layer is referred to as deep groundwater.

Beneath Parcel 2 the fill material extends in depth from 4 to 16 feet below ground surface (see Figure 3). The fill material consists primarily of ash, cinder, sand, gravel, and a lesser degree of slag than was found on Parcel 1. Slag was found beneath the portions of Parcel 2 closest to the Hudson River. Native soils underlying the fill material are comprised predominantly of silts, with varying percentages of clay, overlying sand and gravel deposits. Shallow groundwater was encountered

above the silt layer, while deep groundwater was encountered within a sand and gravel layer beneath the silt layer. As depicted on Figure 3, the thickness of fill increases in the central portions of Parcel 2 and forms a trough-like feature within the silt layer. Subsurface foundation and vault structures were observed during the investigation of the Parcel.

Beneath Parcel 3 the subsurface profile consists of fill material (silt, sand, cinder and slag) that ranges in depth from approximately 6 to 8 feet below ground surface. The underlying native soils consist of silts with small percentages of clay.

The water table beneath the entire site ranged in depth from approximately 4 to 19 feet below ground surface in the shallow, unconfined aquifer, and from approximately 20 to 33 feet below ground surface for the deep, semi-confined aquifer located in the sand and gravel below the silt unit.

Generally, groundwater flows in a westerly direction towards the Hudson River. However, north of Parcel 2, isolated groundwater flows to the southwest and northwest were observed. Also, shallow groundwater flow beneath Parcel 2 appears to follow the topography of the silt layer and converges in a narrow trough area on the central portion of the parcel (see Figure 4). Deep groundwater flow beneath Parcel 2 is towards the northwest, where it eventually changes direction and proceeds in a westerly direction towards the Hudson River.

Water levels in monitoring wells located near the Hudson River were observed to change with tidal fluctuations in the river. Monitoring wells located on the southern and eastern portions of Parcel 1, further away from the Hudson River, showed a lesser degree of tidal influence.

### **5.1.2: Nature of Contamination**

As described in the RI report, many soil and groundwater samples were collected to characterize the nature and extent of contamination. As summarized in Tables 1a through 1c, the main categories of contaminants that exceed their SCGs are volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and inorganics (metals).

The VOCs of concern are acetone, methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE), benzene, toluene, xylenes, and isopropyl benzene. Acetone is a component of paint thinner and other solvents, and the remainder are components of gasoline. These were found in a buried tank and buried drums that were discovered during the investigation and subsequently removed from the site, as described in Section 5.2. However these contaminants remain in soil and groundwater beneath the disposal area.

The SVOCs of concern in soil and fill are polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), such as benzo(a)pyrene, chrysene, and benzo(a)anthracene. These PAHs are commonly associated with coal, ash, heavy petroleum oils and products of incomplete combustion. Seven of these compounds are known or suspected human carcinogens. These contaminants have low volatility and low solubility in water, and are typically transported in the solid phase as dust or particles in groundwater.

The inorganic contaminants of concern include the metals arsenic, beryllium, iron, cadmium, chromium, copper, manganese, mercury, nickel, selenium and zinc. These were found throughout

the surface and subsurface fill, and are commonly associated with the historical disposal of slag from iron and steel production at the site.

### **5.1.3: Extent of Contamination**

This section describes the findings of the investigation for all environmental media that were investigated. Because the site is comprised of three discontinuous parcels with somewhat different contamination characteristics, the extent of contamination is described separately for each parcel. As discussed below, “subsurface soil” includes fill material - the slag and other materials that were historically used for fill - and the native soil that lies beneath the fill material. In many locations, the fill material also contains interbedded layers of native soil, which may have been used as intermediate cover during filling.

Chemical concentrations are reported in parts per billion (ppb) for water, parts per million (ppm) for fill materials and soil. For comparison purposes, where applicable, SCGs are provided for each medium.

Tables 1a through 1c summarize the degree of contamination for the contaminants of concern in soil, fill and groundwater and compares the data with the SCGs for the site. The following are the media which were investigated and a summary of the findings of the investigation.

#### **PARCEL 1**

##### **Surface Soil (0-2 inches)**

Surface soil collected from several locations on Parcel 1 was found to contain PAHs at levels that exceed their SCGs. The highest levels were found at locations in the eastern portion of the parcel, near the railroad tracks. One of these locations also contained the highest levels of several metals listed in Table 1, including cadmium, chromium, copper, mercury, nickel, selenium, and zinc.

Samples across the parcel contained elevated levels of arsenic, beryllium, copper, iron, selenium and zinc. Based on very high levels of iron in these samples, these metals are likely associated with slag.

##### **Subsurface Soil**

Subsurface soil beneath Parcel 1 generally contains the same distribution and level of contaminants as surface soils, with frequent detections of benzo(a)pyrene, arsenic, beryllium, iron, nickel, selenium and zinc above cleanup guidelines. As shown on Figure 3, the depth of fill ranges from 8 feet along the eastern portion of the site to 32 feet along the Hudson River shoreline. The estimated volume of fill material beneath Parcel 1 is 603,000 cubic yards.

##### **Groundwater**

A limited area of groundwater contamination is present in the northeast corner of Parcel 1, where the tank and drums were removed. Levels of benzene (17 ppb), toluene (110 ppb), ethylbenzene

(110 ppb) and xylenes (430 ppb) exceed their groundwater quality standards (1 ppb, 5 ppb, 5 ppb, and 5 ppb, respectively). This area of groundwater contamination extends approximately 50 feet from the source area that was removed as described in Section 5.2.

Groundwater beneath the remainder of Parcel 1 exceeds ambient water quality standards for the inorganic compounds iron, manganese and selenium. Iron and manganese exceedances were significant, with maximum detections of 3,690 ppb and 3,670 ppb, compared to their 300 ppb standard. Selenium detections were minor, with a maximum concentration of 13.9 ppb, compared to its standard of 10 ppb.

## **PARCEL 2**

### **Surface Soil (0-2 inches)**

The highest levels of SVOCs in surface soil were found in sample SS-17, which is located in the eastern portion of Parcel 2, approximately 50 feet west of the exposed petroleum pipeline pipe pit. Although surface soil in this area did not show visual evidence of petroleum contamination, the analytical results indicate that surface soil has been impacted. Levels of benzo(a)anthracene (11 ppm), chrysene (11 ppm), benzo(b)fluoranthene (14 ppm) and benzo(a)pyrene (8.8 ppm) were the highest detected on any of the three parcels.

### **Subsurface Soil**

Subsurface fill material beneath Parcel 2 ranges from 4 to 16 feet thick, and contains similar levels of the contaminants found throughout the site. The estimated volume of fill material beneath Parcel 2 is 64,400 cubic yards. Test pits and soil borings near and next to the abandoned petroleum pipeline did not reveal any evidence of petroleum contamination.

### **Groundwater**

One well on Parcel 2 contained benzene, ethyl benzene and isopropyl benzene at 23 ppb, 15 ppb, and 6.6 ppb, respectively, compared to their groundwater quality standards of 1 ppb, 5 ppb and 5 ppb respectively. This location is downgradient of the former Sperry Warehouse, which has been identified as a potential source of petroleum contamination. A different well, located along Main Street, contained 18 ppb of methylene chloride, compared to its standard of 5 ppb. This compound was not found in any other wells at the site, and the source is unknown.

Groundwater beneath Parcel 2 contained high levels of iron and manganese in nearly all of the samples collected. Maximum levels of iron and manganese were 21,700 ppb and 734 ppb, compared to their water quality standard of 300 ppb.

## **PARCEL 3**

### **Surface Soil (0-2 inches)**

The surface soil sample collected from Parcel 3 contained slightly elevated concentrations of PAHs and metals. Levels of both metals and PAHs were generally lower than in surface soils collected from the other two parcels.

### **Subsurface Soil**

Fill material on Parcel 3 ranges from 6 to 8 feet thick beneath this parcel. The sample of subsurface soil collected at this location did not contain any SVOCs above their respective cleanup guidelines. Only iron and manganese exceeded their cleanup guidelines, at levels of 2560 ppm and 1480 ppm, respectively.

### **Groundwater**

Groundwater beneath Parcel 3 contained elevated levels of iron and manganese. No VOCs or SVOCs were detected above their respective ambient quality standards.

## **5.2: Interim Remedial Measures**

An interim remedial measure (IRM) is conducted at a site when a source of contamination or exposure pathway can be effectively addressed before completion of the RI/FS.

In October 2004, a driller working in the northeast corner of Parcel 1 reported that he had encountered a possible buried vessel containing a thick black material with a paint-like odor. This location is shown on Figure 2. Drilling activity in this area was suspended, and the IDA mobilized excavation equipment to uncover and remove the vessel. When the excavation was opened, two 55-gallon drums and one 1000-gallon tank were found, buried at a depth of approximately 12 feet below grade. The two drums were placed into overpack containers and tested for proper off-site disposal. The contents of the buried tank were pumped out, after which the tank was cleaned and removed from the ground.

Analysis of the liquid contents of the excavated tank revealed the presence of toluene, methylene chloride, methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE), phenol and methylphenols. These compounds are consistent with a



Buried Drum and Tank



Overpack of the Excavated Drum

mixture of waste gasoline and methylene chloride. The contents of one of the 55-gallon drums was found to be an ignitable hazardous waste containing several gasoline-related compounds such as benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene and xylenes (BTEX). The second 55-gallon drum contained a tarry substance that contained many semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs).

Grossly contaminated soil in the immediate vicinity of the buried tank and drums was removed and temporarily staged on a polyethylene sheet. An attempt was made to excavate all contaminated soil from the disposal area. However, based on field meter readings, the extent of contamination proved to be too extensive to excavate. As a result, the staged contaminated soil was placed back in the excavation and re-covered, to be addressed as part of the comprehensive site remedy. A sheet of polyethylene was placed over the contaminated backfill, at approximately 10 feet below ground surface, to separate clean soil from contaminated soil and to enhance a possible soil vapor extraction system (see Section 7.1). Two groundwater monitoring wells were installed in the backfilled area, and a supplemental investigation was later conducted in this area to fully delineate the extent of contamination, as described in Section 5.1.



Temporary Staging of Contaminated Soil



Excavation of the Buried Tank

### 5.3: Summary of Human Exposure Pathways:

This section describes the types of human exposures that may present added health risks to persons at or around the site. A more detailed discussion of the human exposure pathways can be found in Section 6.1 of the RI report.

An exposure pathway describes the means by which an individual may be exposed to contaminants originating from a site. An exposure pathway has five elements: [1] a contaminant source, [2] contaminant release and transport mechanisms, [3] a point of exposure, [4] a route of exposure, and [5] a receptor population.

The source of contamination is the location where contaminants were released to the environment (any waste disposal area or point of discharge). Contaminant release and transport mechanisms carry contaminants from the source to a point where people may be exposed. The exposure point is a location where actual or potential human contact with a contaminated medium may occur. The route of exposure is the manner in which a contaminant actually enters or contacts the body (e.g., ingestion, inhalation, or direct contact). The receptor population is the people who are, or may be, exposed to contaminants at a point of exposure.

An exposure pathway is complete when all five elements of an exposure pathway exist. An exposure pathway is considered a potential pathway when one or more of the elements currently does not exist, but could in the future.

Potential pathways of exposure to site contaminants are discussed below:

### **Surface Soil**

Dermal contact, ingestion and inhalation of surface soil contaminated with metals and SVOCs is a potential exposure pathway for site trespassers, site visitors and future site workers. The potential also exists for off-site residents to contact, ingest or inhale contaminated surface soil from the off-site migration of dust or from the deposition of site-related contaminants by stormwater runoff.

The selected remedy will further reduce the potential for future exposures to surface soil contaminants through the placement of a barrier to contact (clean soil cover/vegetation or pavement). The remedy will also include institutional controls which will require that any on-site excavations be performed under a site management plan which will address potential worker/community contact with surface soil contamination.

### **Subsurface Soil**

There are currently no completed exposure pathways for subsurface soil and fill. Direct contact, ingestion or inhalation of subsurface soil contaminated with VOCs, SVOCs and metals are potential exposure pathways for future site workers who may contact subsurface soil during future remedial or construction work. Site visitors, trespassers and nearby community residents could potentially be exposed to contaminants in subsurface soil through the inhalation of dusts generated during future site excavation/construction work.

The selected remedy will minimize potential exposures through the development of a site management plan, environmental easements, and maintenance of the soil or asphalt cover.

### **Groundwater**

Ingestion, direct contact or inhalation of groundwater containing VOCs, SVOCs and metals is a potential exposure pathway at this site.

The site and surrounding area are served by public water; therefore, exposure to groundwater contaminants via ingestion, direct contact or inhalation is unlikely. Under the selected remedy, the

site will continue to be managed as a commercial/industrial site and institutional controls (e.g. environmental easements) will be imposed to mitigate future exposure pathways. This will include a groundwater use restriction to prevent the use of groundwater as a potable water source without treatment as determined by the NYSDOH. Additionally, the selected remedy includes the remediation of groundwater contamination in the portion of Parcel 1 where the buried tank and drums were removed. This action will further minimize future exposure pathways as the groundwater contaminant source area on this parcel will be removed.

### **Soil Vapor**

Volatile chemicals in subsurface soil or groundwater can be a source for soil vapor contamination and can potentially affect the indoor air quality of future on-site structures through the process of vapor intrusion.

The selected remedy includes implementation of a site management plan which will require an evaluation of the potential for vapor intrusion in any buildings to be developed on the site.

#### **5.4: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

This section summarizes the existing and potential future environmental impacts presented by the site. Environmental impacts include existing and potential future exposure pathways to fish and wildlife receptors, as well as damage to natural resources such as aquifers and wetlands.

The Fish and Wildlife Impact Analysis, which is Exhibit 4 of the RI report, presents a detailed evaluation of the habitats present at the site and the potential impacts to fish and wildlife receptors. The evaluation indicates that the habitat value of the site is low due to its historical industrial use and extensive placement of fill. The RI indicates that contaminants present at the site are unlikely to migrate into the adjacent Hudson River.

In a portion of the site where soluble contaminants are present, site contamination has impacted the groundwater resource of the shallow water bearing unit.

### **SECTION 6: SUMMARY OF THE REMEDIATION GOALS AND THE PROPOSED USE OF THE SITE**

Goals for the remedial program have been established through the remedy selection process stated in 6 NYCRR Part 375-1.10. At a minimum, the remedy selected must eliminate or mitigate all significant threats to public health and/or the environment presented by the hazardous substances disposed at the site through the proper application of scientific and engineering principles.

The proposed future use for the South Troy Industrial Park is commercial and industrial, with a portion of Parcel 1 under consideration for restricted residential use. A corridor along the western edge of Parcel 1, adjacent to the Hudson River may also be used for passive recreational purposes (i.e., a bike path).

The remediation goals for this site are to eliminate or reduce to the extent practicable:

- exposures of persons at or around the site to metals and SVOCs in surface and subsurface soils and fill;
- the release of contaminants from soil into groundwater that may create exceedances of groundwater quality standards; and
- the release of contaminants from soils or groundwater into indoor air of future overlying buildings through soil vapor intrusion.

Further, the remediation goals for the site include attaining to the extent practicable:

- ambient groundwater quality standards

## **SECTION 7: SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES**

The selected remedy must be protective of human health and the environment, be cost-effective, and comply with other statutory requirements. Potential remedial alternatives for the South Troy Industrial Park Site were identified, screened and evaluated in the AA Report which is available at the document repositories identified in Section 1. Because the site is comprised of three discontinuous parcels with somewhat different contaminant characteristics, the AA Report developed and evaluated alternatives separately for each parcel. The alternatives are numbered so the parcel number is followed by the alternative number for that parcel (e.g., 1-1, 1-2, 2-1, etc.)

A summary of the remedial alternatives that were considered for this site are discussed below. The present worth represents the amount of money invested in the current year that would be sufficient to cover all present and future costs associated with the alternative. This enables the costs of remedial alternatives to be compared on a common basis. As a convention, a time frame of 30 years is used to evaluate present worth costs for alternatives with an indefinite duration. This does not imply that operation, maintenance, or monitoring would cease after 30 years if remediation goals are not achieved.

### **7.1: Description of Remedial Alternatives**

The following potential remedies were considered to address the contaminated soil and groundwater at the site.

#### **PARCEL 1**

##### **Alternative 1-1: No Further Action**

The No Further Action alternative recognizes remediation of the site conducted under the previously completed IRM. To evaluate the effectiveness of the remediation completed under the IRM; only continued monitoring would be necessary. This alternative would leave the site in its present condition and would not provide any additional protection to human health or the environment.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 30,735
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 0
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 5,750

**Alternative 1-2: Institutional Controls**

This alternative would also leave the site in its present condition, but would place an institutional control on the site to restrict future land use and notify future owners or prospective purchasers of the presence of contamination. This institutional control would be in the form of an environmental easement granted to the NYSDEC.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 23,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 5,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 1,200
Time to Implement .....	3 months

**Alternative 1-3: Soil Cover and Institutional Controls**

This alternative would place a soil cover system with a minimum depth of 12 inches over the parcel, which would be protected and maintained by implementation of a Site Management Plan and an associated institutional control. The soil cover system would consist, from bottom to top, of a demarcation layer; a barrier layer of clean soil at least 8 inches thick; and a 4-inch layer of clean soil capable of supporting vegetative growth. The demarcation layer would be a plastic geogrid material, such as orange snow fencing, to identify the presence of potentially contaminated fill beneath it and to provide a physical barrier against unintended penetration. The top layer of the soil cover would be seeded, except where development plans for the site specify pavement or concrete surfaces. If site development can be coordinated with remediation, the soil cover could be replaced by paved surfaces or building slabs.

In order to place a soil cover over the northwestern corner of the site, Slag Mountain would have to be taken down to create a stable slope. Because only a portion of the pile is present on the site, this alternative would involve the removal of the pile up to the property line, while leaving a stable slope on the adjacent property. This alternative assumes that the excavated slag would be crushed and spread on the site prior to capping. However, this material may also qualify for beneficial re-use in road construction or other structural fill.

The Site Management Plan developed under this alternative would specify the procedures necessary to maintain the site remedy and protect the future occupants of the site. These include provisions for managing contaminated soils that may be excavated from the site during future development activities. The plan would specify procedures for proper characterization, disposal and/or replacement of excavated material, and full repair of the soil cover system. The SMP would also require an evaluation of the potential for vapor intrusion in any buildings developed on the site. The plan would also specify the monitoring and maintenance requirements to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the remedy.

In addition to the elements of the institutional control listed in Alternative 1-2, the environmental easement granted to the NYSDEC would include enforceable provisions associated with the technical requirements of the Site Management Plan. These include identification of the barrier layer and demarcation layer, a requirement for compliance with the Site Management Plan, and a requirement for periodic certification that the remedy is effective. This easement would also serve to notify future owners and prospective purchasers of the technical elements of the remedy.

Groundwater would be monitored at the site to verify whether contaminant concentrations are stable. For cost estimating purposes, this alternative assumes that groundwater would be monitored annually for the first 5 years after construction, then every 5 years thereafter.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 2,084,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 1,940,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$13,150
Time to Implement .....	1 year

**Alternative 1-4: Soil Cover, Groundwater Remediation, and Institutional Controls**

In addition to the elements listed in Alternative 1-3, this alternative would provide for the treatment of residual soil and groundwater contamination in the portion of Parcel 1 where the buried tank and drums were removed. The AA Report identified three potential technologies for soil and groundwater treatment: multi-phase extraction; chemical oxidation; and air sparging/soil vapor extraction. These technologies are briefly described on the following page.

The AA Report concluded that multi-phase extraction would be the most effective technology to remediate soil and groundwater due to its lower cost, shortest time frame and equal effectiveness. As a result, pumping groundwater and vapors is evaluated as the representative technology in this alternative. However, if site conditions or remediation costs change during the design phase, one of the other technologies could be considered.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 2,298,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 2,154,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 13,150
Time to Implement .....	2 years

PARCEL 2

**Alternative 2-1: No Action**

The No Action Alternative is evaluated as a procedural requirement and as a basis for comparison. This alternative would leave the site in its present condition and would not provide any additional protection to human health or the environment.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 0
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 0
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 0

## **Remedial Technologies for Volatile Organic Contamination in Soil and Groundwater**

### **Multi-Phase Extraction and Treatment**

Multi-phase extraction involves the pumping of contaminated vapor and groundwater from beneath the site. Extraction wells are installed, groundwater is pumped, and a vacuum is applied to soils above the groundwater table. The extracted vapors and liquids are then treated prior to discharge to the atmosphere and sanitary sewer, respectively. The advantage of the multi-phase extraction system is that it lowers the groundwater table, creating newly unsaturated soils that can be treated by vapor extraction.

### **Soil Vapor Extraction and Air Sparging**

#### **Soil Vapor Extraction**

Soil vapor extraction (SVE), also known as "soil venting" or "vacuum extraction", is a remedial technology that reduces concentrations of volatile contaminants adsorbed to soils above the groundwater table. In this technology, a vacuum is applied to wells near the source of soil contamination. Volatile contaminants evaporate, and the vapors are drawn toward the extraction wells. Extracted vapor is then treated as necessary, usually with carbon adsorption, before being released to the atmosphere. Although SVE does not fully remediate semivolatile contaminants, some reduction may occur due to the stimulation of biological activity as oxygen is delivered to the subsurface.

#### **Air Sparging**

Air sparging is a remedial technology that reduces concentrations of volatile contaminants that are adsorbed to soils below the water table and dissolved in groundwater. This technology involves the injection of clean air into groundwater, causing the contaminants to move from a dissolved state to the vapor phase. The air is then vented through the unsaturated zone. Air sparging is usually used together with SVE to treat both groundwater and soil, and to prevent the migration of vapors. This combined system, which consists of a series of air injection and vapor extraction wells, is called AS/SVE.

### **Chemical Oxidation**

In-situ chemical oxidation is an in-place treatment technology that uses an oxidant such as peroxide or permanganate to destroy contaminants in both soil and groundwater. The oxidant would be injected through a series of wells into the subsurface, where it would migrate through the aquifer and break down contaminants that are amenable to oxidation. In-situ oxidation is effective for the VOCs of concern at this site, and would fully break down these contaminants without creating by-products of concern. This technology is not effective for treating many SVOCs or any metals. To determine the best oxidant and optimal injection rate for the specific contaminants and site conditions, a pilot study would be necessary.

### Alternative 2-2: Institutional Controls

As for Alternative 1-2, this alternative would leave Parcel 2 in its present condition, but would place an institutional control on the property to restrict future land use and notify future owners or prospective purchasers of the presence of contamination. This institutional control would be in the form of an environmental easement granted to the NYSDEC.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 14,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 5,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 600
Time to Implement .....	3 months

### Alternative 2-3: Soil Cover, Piping Removal and Institutional Controls

This alternative would apply to Parcel 2 the same minimum 12-inch clean soil cover, Site Management Plan and institutional controls described in Alternative 1-3. However, it would also remove the portion of the fuel oil pipelines that lie beneath this parcel. The pipes would be cut at both ends where they enter the property and removed from the site. At the property line, the pipe ends would be sealed to prevent any material in the lines from leaking onto the site. Any residual petroleum in the pipes would be properly disposed, and any soil contamination discovered as the pipes are excavated would be excavated and removed.

Present Worth: .....	\$422,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 325,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 9,300
Time to Implement .....	1 year

### PARCEL 3

#### Alternative 3-1: No Action

The No Action Alternative is evaluated as a procedural requirement and as a basis for comparison. This alternative would leave the site in its present condition and would not provide any additional protection to human health or the environment.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 0
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 0
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 0

#### Alternative 3-2: Institutional Controls

As for Alternatives 1-2 and 2-2, this alternative would leave Parcel 3 in its present condition, but would place an institutional control on the property to restrict future land use and notify future owners or prospective purchasers of the presence of contamination. This institutional control would be in the form of an environmental easement granted to the NYSDEC.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 10,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 5,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 330
Time to Implement .....	3 months

**Alternative 3-3: Soil Cover and Institutional Controls**

This alternative would apply to Parcel 3 the same minimum 12-inch clean soil cover, Site Management Plan and institutional controls described in Alternative 1-3.

Present Worth: .....	\$68,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 48,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 1,300
Time to Implement .....	1 year

**Alternative 3-4: Excavation of Fill Material**

Because Parcel 3 is much smaller than the other parcels, and because the thickness of fill material is less, full excavation of fill was retained as a feasible technology in the AA Report. An estimated 2,900 cubic yards of fill would be excavated and removed from the site, and the site would be backfilled with clean soil. Because all contamination would be removed from the site, no institutional controls would be necessary under this alternative.

Present Worth: .....	\$ 601,000
Capital Cost: .....	\$ 601,000
Annual OM&M .....	\$ 0
Time to Implement .....	1 year

**7.2 Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives**

The criteria to which potential remedial alternatives are compared are defined in 6 NYCRR Part 375, which governs the remediation of environmental restoration projects in New York State. A detailed discussion of the evaluation criteria and comparative analysis is included in the AA Report.

The first two evaluation criteria are termed “threshold criteria” and must be satisfied in order for an alternative to be considered for selection.

1. Protection of Human Health and the Environment. This criterion is an overall evaluation of each alternative’s ability to protect public health and the environment.
2. Compliance with New York State Standards, Criteria, and Guidance (SCGs). Compliance with SCGs addresses whether a remedy will meet environmental laws, regulations, and other standards and criteria. In addition, this criterion includes the consideration of guidance which the NYSDEC has determined to be applicable on a case-specific basis.

The next five “primary balancing criteria” are used to compare the positive and negative aspects of each of the remedial strategies.

3. Short-term Effectiveness. The potential short-term adverse impacts of the remedial action upon the community, the workers, and the environment during the construction and/or implementation are evaluated. The length of time needed to achieve the remedial objectives is also estimated and compared against the other alternatives.

4. Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence. This criterion evaluates the long-term effectiveness of the remedial alternatives after implementation. If wastes or treated residuals remain on-site after the selected remedy has been implemented, the following items are evaluated: 1) the magnitude of the remaining risks, 2) the adequacy of the engineering and/or institutional controls intended to limit the risk, and 3) the reliability of these controls.

5. Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume. Preference is given to alternatives that permanently and significantly reduce the toxicity, mobility or volume of the wastes at the site.

6. Implementability. The technical and administrative feasibility of implementing each alternative are evaluated. Technical feasibility includes the difficulties associated with the construction of the remedy and the ability to monitor its effectiveness. For administrative feasibility, the availability of the necessary personnel and materials is evaluated along with potential difficulties in obtaining specific operating approvals, access for construction, institutional controls, and so forth.

7. Cost-Effectiveness. Capital costs and operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs are estimated for each alternative and compared on a present worth basis. Although cost-effectiveness is the last balancing criterion evaluated, where two or more alternatives have met the requirements of the other criteria, it can be used as the basis for the final decision. The costs for each alternative are presented in Table 1.

This final criterion is considered a “modifying criterion” and is taken into account after evaluating those above. It is evaluated after public comments on the Proposed Remedial Action Plan have been received.

8. Community Acceptance - Concerns of the community regarding the RI/AAR reports and the PRAP have been evaluated. The responsiveness summary (Appendix A) presents the public comments received and the manner in which the NYSDEC addressed the concerns raised.

One significant comment was received that resulted in a substantive change to the Record of Decision. A portion of Parcel 1 has been identified for possible use as an expansion to the adjacent County Jail facility. Because inmate housing is considered to be a restricted residential use, the ROD was revised to accommodate this possibility.

## **SECTION 8: SUMMARY OF THE SELECTED REMEDY**

Based on the Administrative Record (Appendix B), the NYSDEC has selected the following remedy for this site:

Parcel 1

1-4: Groundwater Remediation, Soil Cover and Institutional Controls

Parcel 2

2-3: Soil Cover, Piping Removal and Institutional Controls

Parcel 3

3-3: Soil Cover and Institutional Controls

The elements of this remedy are described at the end of this section and depicted in Figure 5. The selected remedy is based on the results of the RI and the evaluation of alternatives presented in the AAR.

Alternatives 1-4, 2-3 and 3-3 were selected because they satisfy the threshold criteria and provide the best balance of the primary balancing criteria described in Section 7.2. They will achieve the remediation goals for the site by covering the soil and fill materials that pose a direct exposure threat to public health and the environment, and by creating the conditions needed to restore groundwater quality to the extent practicable. Residual soil and groundwater contamination in the IRM area will be remediated to ensure that potential vapor and groundwater exposures are eliminated.

Although groundwater beneath Parcel 2 is contaminated with low levels of petroleum-related compounds, the source of this contamination appears to be an adjacent parcel. Potential exposure to these contaminants will be addressed by the Site Management Plan's requirement that the potential for vapor intrusion be evaluated and mitigated as necessary for any new buildings constructed at the site. Removal of the former petroleum pipeline from Parcel 2 will ensure that if it contains any residual petroleum, it poses no risk of future release. Removal of the pipes and access pit will also make the site more suitable for future development.

For Parcel 3, full excavation would pose significant short-term risks and would be difficult to implement. Concern for the railroad tracks adjacent to the property would likely require extensive structural protection and coordination with Conrail, causing extensive delays during the design phase. Because much of the waterfront area was filled with similar fill, the benefits of excavating fill from this parcel are small, and public health and the environment will be protected with a soil cover.

The estimated present worth cost to implement the remedy is \$ 2,788,000. The cost to construct the remedy is estimated to be \$ \$2,527,000 and the estimated average annual operation, maintenance, and monitoring costs for 30 years is \$ \$23,750.

The elements of the selected remedy are as follows:

1. A remedial design program will be implemented to provide the details necessary for the construction, operation, maintenance, and monitoring of the remedial program.

2. A soil cover will be constructed over all vegetated areas to prevent exposure to contaminated soils. The cover will consist of at least 12 inches of clean soil underlain by an indicator such as orange plastic snow fence to demarcate the cover soil from the subsurface soil. The top four inches of soil will be of sufficient quality to support vegetation. For portions of the site designated for restricted residential use, the clean soil cover will be at least 24 inches thick, underlain by a demarcation layer. Clean soil will constitute soil with no analytes in exceedance of NYSDEC TAGM 4046 soil cleanup objectives as determined by the procedure in DER 10 ("Tech Guide"). Non-vegetated areas (buildings, roadways, parking lots, etc) will be covered by a paving system or concrete at least 6 inches in thickness.
3. Treatment of soil and groundwater in the area of Parcel 1 where the tank and drums were removed. Multi-phase extraction is selected as the representative treatment technology. Groundwater and soil vapor will be pumped and treated prior to discharge to the sanitary sewer and atmosphere, respectively.
4. Excavation and off-site disposal of the portion of the petroleum pipelines that crosses Parcel 2 of the site. The remaining ends of the pipes will be capped at the site boundary.
5. Development of a site management plan to: (a) address residually contaminated soils and fill material that may be excavated from the site during future redevelopment. The plan will require soil characterization and, where applicable, disposal/reuse in accordance with NYSDEC regulations; (b) evaluate the potential for vapor intrusion for any buildings developed on the site; (c) identify any use restrictions; and (d) provide for the monitoring and maintenance of the components of the remedy.
6. Imposition of an institutional control in the form of an environmental easement that will: (a) require compliance with the approved site management plan; (b) limit the use and development of the property to commercial, industrial and passive recreational uses only, except where a restricted residential use is planned and a 24-inch soil cover will be placed; (c) restrict the use of groundwater as a source of potable water and other uses without necessary water quality treatment as determined by NYSDOH; and (d) require the property owner to complete and submit a certification to the NYSDEC on a periodic basis.
7. Periodic certification by the property owner, prepared and submitted by a professional engineer or such other expert acceptable to the NYSDEC, until the NYSDEC notifies the property owner in writing that this certification is no longer needed. This submittal will contain certification that the institutional controls and engineering controls, are still in place, allow the NYSDEC access to the site, and that nothing has occurred that would impair the ability of the control to protect public health or the environment, or constitute a violation or failure to comply with the site management plan.
8. The operation of the components of the remedy will continue until the remedial objectives have been achieved, or until the NYSDEC determines that continued operation is technically impracticable or not feasible.

9. Since the remedy results in untreated hazardous substances remaining at the site, a long term groundwater monitoring program will be instituted. This program will allow the effectiveness of the groundwater treatment to be monitored and will be a component of the operation, maintenance, and monitoring for the site.

## **SECTION 9: HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION**

As part of the South Troy Industrial Park environmental restoration process, a number of Citizen Participation activities were undertaken to inform and educate the public about conditions at the site and the potential remedial alternatives. The following public participation activities were conducted for the site:

- Repositories for documents pertaining to the site were established.
- A public contact list, which included nearby property owners, elected officials, local media and other interested parties, was established.
- In August 2004, a fact sheet was mailed to the public contact list announcing the start of the remedial investigation.
- In February 2006, a fact sheet was mailed to the public contact list summarizing the results of the remedial investigation, describing the Proposed Remedial Action Plan, and announcing the public meeting and comment period.
- A public meeting was held on February 28, 2006 to present and receive comment on the PRAP.
- A responsiveness summary (Appendix A) was prepared to address the comments received during the public comment period for the PRAP.

**TABLE 1A:  
Nature and Extent of Contamination  
PARCEL 1**

<b>SURFACE SOIL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)</b>	Benzo(a)anthracene	ND (0.0056) - 3.0	0.224	6 of 16
	Chrysene	ND (0.012) - 3.4	0.40	6 of 16
	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ND (0.021) - 4.7	1.1	3 of 16
	Benzo(K)fluoranthene	ND (0.013) - 2.8	1.1	3 of 16
	Benzo(a)pyrene	ND (0.0064) - 2.8	0.061	9 of 16
	Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND (0.011) - 0.11	0.014	5 of 16
<b>Inorganic Compounds</b>	Arsenic	4.42 - 37.5	7.5	12 of 16
	Barium	73.5 - 893	300	4 of 16
	Beryllium	0.264 - 5.49	0.16	16 of 16
	Cadmium	0.594 - 17.2	10	1 of 16
	Chromium	7.59 - 309	50	2 of 16
	Copper	7.78 - 1,020	25	11 of 16
	Iron	22,400 - 144,000	2,000	16 of 16
	Mercury	ND (0.006) - 3.6	0.10	3 of 16
	Nickel	5.17 - 124	13	11 of 16
	Selenium	0.998 - 6.11	2.0	13 of 16
	Zinc	43.2 - 5,290	20	16 of 16

<b>SUBSURFACE SOIL AND FILL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)</b>	Benzo(a)anthracene	ND (0.005) - 1.4	0.224	13 of 53
	Chrysene	ND (0.011) - 1.2	0.40	6 of 53
	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ND (0.019) - 1.2	1.1	1 of 53
	Benzo(a)pyrene	ND (0.006) - 1.1	0.061	22 of 53
	Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND (0.01) - 0.19	0.014	5 of 53

**TABLE 1A:  
Nature and Extent of Contamination**

<b>SUBSURFACE SOIL AND FILL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Inorganic Compounds</b>	Arsenic	2.58 - 44.5	7.5	20 of 46
	Barium	20.1 - 350	300	2 of 46
	Beryllium	0.08 - 7.64	0.16	44 of 46
	Chromium	ND (0.112) - 106	50	1 of 46
	Copper	2.96 - 149	25	15 of 46
	Iron	6,010 - 169,000	2000	46 of 46
	Mercury	ND (0.006) - 0.366	0.10	11 of 46
	Nickel	1.44 - 136	13	29 of 46
	Selenium	0.337 - 12	2	20 of 46
	Zinc	9.38 - 949	20	45 of 46

<b>GROUNDWATER</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)</b>	Acetone	ND (2.3) - 66	50	1 of 12
	Methyl t-butyl ether	ND (0.28) - 27	10	1 of 12
	Benzene	ND (0.24) - 17	1	4 of 12
	Toluene	ND (0.36) - 110	5	1 of 12
	Ethyl benzene	ND (0.41) - 110	5	2 of 12
	Xylenes (total)	ND (0.37) - 430	5	2 of 12
	Isopropyl benzene	ND (0.33) - 38	5	2 of 12
<b>Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)</b>	Naphthalene	ND (0.27) - 83	10	1 of 12
	2-Methyl naphthalene	ND (0.5) - 16	N/A	
<b>Inorganic Compounds</b>	Cobalt	ND (2.38) - 5.4	5.0	1 of 8
	Iron	62.4 - 3,690	300	6 of 8
	Manganese	8.06 - 3,670	300	5 of 8
	Selenium	ND (5.2) - 13.9	10	3 of 8

**TABLE 1A:**  
**Nature and Extent of Contamination**  
**PARCEL 1**

<sup>a</sup> ppb = parts per billion, which is equivalent to micrograms per liter, ug/L, in water;  
ppm = parts per million, which is equivalent to milligrams per kilogram, mg/kg, in soil;

<sup>b</sup> SCG = standards, criteria, and guidance values; {list SCGs for each medium}

ND - Not detected at the concentration listed in parentheses

N/A - No groundwater standard or guidance value exists for 2-methyl naphthalene

**TABLE 1B:  
Nature and Extent of Contamination  
PARCEL 2**

<b>SURFACE SOIL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)</b>	Benzo(a)anthracene	1.3 - 11	0.224	4 of 4
	Chrysene	1.6 - 11	0.4	4 of 4
	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	1.1 - 14	1.1	3 of 4
	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	1.5 - 7.2	1.1	3 of 4
	Benzo(a)pyrene	1.0 - 8.8	0.061	4 of 4
	Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND (0.013) - 0.7	0.014	3 of 4
<b>Inorganic Compounds</b>	Arsenic	8.3 - 16.6	7.5	4 of 4
	Beryllium	0.36 - 0.79	0.16	4 of 4
	Copper	23.8 - 34.5	25	2 of 4
	Iron	11,300 - 32,300	2,000	4 of 4
	Mercury	ND (0.006) - 0.222	0.1	2 of 4
	Nickel	12.7 - 24.6	13	3 of 4
	Selenium	0.373 - 2.16	2	1 of 4
	Zinc	40.2 - 251	20	3 of 4

<b>SUBSURFACE SOIL AND FILL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)</b>	Benzo(a)anthracene	ND (0.005) - 1.0	0.224	2 of 24
	Chrysene	ND (0.011) - 1.2	0.40	2 of 24
	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ND (0.018) - 1.24	1.1	1 of 24
	Benzo(a)pyrene	ND (0.006) - 0.86	0.061	2 of 24
	Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND (0.01) - 0.21	0.014	1 of 24
<b>Inorganic</b>	Arsenic	1.81 - 51	7.5	5 of 11
	Beryllium	0.214 - 2.89	0.16	11 of 11

**TABLE 1B:  
Nature and Extent of Contamination  
PARCEL 2**

<b>SUBSURFACE SOIL AND FILL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
	Cobalt	5.81 - 40.4	30	1 of 11
	Copper	8.63 - 355	25	5 of 11
	Iron	16,300 - 375,000	2000	11 of 11
	Nickel	6.44 - 93.5	13	8 of 11
	Selenium	0.328 - 7.1	2	3 of 11
	Zinc	12.7 - 665	20	9 of 11

<b>GROUNDWATER</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)</b>	Methylene chloride	ND (0.43) - 18	5	1 of 11
	Benzene	ND (0.24) - 23	1	2 of 11
	Ethyl Benzene	ND (0.41) - 15	5	1 of 11
	Isopropyl benzene	ND (0.33) - 6.6	5	1 of 11
<b>Inorganic Compounds</b>	Iron	86.1 - 21,700	300	3 of 4
	Manganese	734 - 6870	300	4 of 4

**TABLE 1C:  
Nature and Extent of Contamination  
PARCEL 3**

<b>SURFACE SOIL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs)</b>	Benzo(a)anthracene	0.74	0.224	1 of 1
	Chrysene	0.78	0.4	1 of 1
	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	1.4	1.1	1 of 1
	Benzo(a)pyrene	0.83	0.061	1 of 1
<b>Inorganic Compounds</b>	Arsenic	14.6	7.5	1 of 1
	Beryllium	0.683	0.16	1 of 1
	Copper	44.4	25	1 of 1
	Iron	59,900	2,000	1 of 1
	Mercury	0.14	0.1	1 of 1
	Nickel	23.5	13	1 of 1
	Zinc	265	20	1 of 1

<b>SUBSURFACE SOIL AND FILL</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppm)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Inorganic Compounds</b>	Arsenic	8.84	7.5	1 of 1
	Beryllium	1.07	0.16	1 of 1
	Copper	32.1	25	1 of 1
	Iron	31,200	2,000	1 of 1
	Nickel	21.7	13	1 of 1
	Selenium	2.26	2	1 of 1
	Zinc	81.6	20	1 of 1


<b>GROUNDWATER</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Inorganic</b>	Iron	1,480	300	1 of 1

<b>GROUNDWATER</b>	<b>Contaminants of Concern</b>	<b>Concentration Range Detected (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>SCG<sup>b</sup> (ppb)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Frequency of Exceeding SCG</b>
<b>Compounds</b>	Manganese	2,560	300	1 of 1

**Table 2  
Remedial Alternative Costs**

<b>Remedial Alternative</b>	<b>Capital Cost</b>	<b>Annual OM&amp;M</b>	<b>Total Present Worth</b>
<b>Parcel 1</b>			
No Action	\$ 0	\$ 5,750	\$ 30,735
Institutional Controls	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,200	\$ 23,000
Soil Cover and Institutional Controls	\$ 1,940,000	\$ 13,150	\$ 2,084,000
Groundwater Remediation, Soil Cover and Institutional Controls	\$ 2,154,000	\$ 13,150	\$ 2,298,000
<b>Parcel 2</b>			
No Action	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Institutional Controls	\$ 5,000	\$ 600	\$ 14,000
Soil Cover and Institutional Controls	\$ 325,000	\$ 9,300	\$ 422,000
<b>Parcel 3</b>			
No Action	\$0	\$0	\$0
Institutional Controls	\$ 5,000	\$ 330	\$ 10,000
Soil Cover and Institutional Controls	\$ 48,000	\$ 1,300	\$ 68,000
Excavation	\$ 601,000	\$ 0	\$ 601,000
<b>Recommended Alternative</b>			
Parcel 1 - Groundwater Remediation, Soil Cover and Institutional Controls			
Parcel 2 - Soil Cover and Institutional Controls	\$ 2,527,000	\$ 23,750	\$ 2,788,000
Parcel 3 - Soil Cover and Institutional Controls			

UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF SECTION 7209 SUBDIVISION 2 OF THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION LAW.



MAP REFERENCE:  
 NYSDOT 1993 TROY SOUTH QUADRANGLE

FIGURE 1 - SITE LOCATION MAP  
 SOUTH TROY INDUSTRIAL PARK

CITY OF TROY RENSSELAER COUNTY, NY

**C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

50 CENTURY HILL DRIVE, P.O. BOX 727, LATHAM, NY 12110  
 518.786.7400 • FAX 518.786.7299


Architecture & Building Systems Engineering • Civil Engineering  
 Environmental Services • Survey & Land Information Services



Date	RECORD OF WORK	Appr.
Drafter: JAM	Checker: KM	
Appr. by:	Proj. No. 04.9138	

SCALE: 1"=500'±

DATE: JUNE 2004




**LEGEND**

AOC 1 AOC DENOTES AREA OF CONCERN

**NOTES:**

"SLAG MOUNTAIN" LOCATION IS APPROXIMATE & CONSTITUTES ONE HALF OF MOUNTAIN, WITH REMAINING PORTIONS LOCATED ON THE PARCEL ADJOINING AOC 1 TO THE NORTH.



CAD DWG. FILE NAME: FIG2 AREAS OF CONCERN (FOR DEC).DWG

NOTE:  
1.) THE LOCATIONS AND FEATURES DEPICTED ON THIS MAP ARE APPROXIMATE AND DO NOT REPRESENT AN ACTUAL FIELD SURVEY.

MAP REFERENCE:  
1.) BOUNDARY SURVEY PREPARED BY C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C., DWG. NO.:01-564, DATED OCT. 8, 2001.

DATE	REVISIONS RECORD/DESCRIPTION	DRAFTED	CHECK	APPR.
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8			
	9			

UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF SECTION 7209 SUBDIVISION 2 OF THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION LAW.  
© 2006  
C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.

DESIGNED :  
DRAFTED : J. KARON  
CHECKED : S. BIEBER  
PROJ. NO: 04.9138  
SCALE : 1"=200'  
DATE : JAN. 24, 2006

## FIGURE 2 AREAS OF CONCERN

### SOUTH TROY INDUSTRIAL PARK BROWNFIELDS INVESTIGATION

CITY OF TROY RENSSELAER COUNTY, NEW YORK


**C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.**  
50 CENTURY HILL DRIVE, P.O. BOX 727, LATHAM, NY 12110  
518.786.7400 \* FAX 518.786.7299

ARCHITECTURE & BUILDING SYSTEMS ENGINEERING \* CIVIL ENGINEERING  
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES \* SURVEY & LAND INFORMATION SERVICES

FIG 2

SHEET 1 OF 4  
DWG. NO: 06-0139


CAD DWG. FILE NAME: FIG2 AREAS OF CONCERN



**LEGEND**

	C.T. MALE SURFACE SOIL SAMPLE
	C.T. MALE MONITORING WELL
	EMPIRE SOILS INVESTIGATION MONITORING WELL
	NORTH AMERICAN INVESTIGATION MONITORING WELL
	STERLING INVESTIGATION MONITORING WELL
	C.T. MALE SOIL BORING
	C.T. MALE TEST PIT
	C.T. MALE EXPLORATORY TRENCH
	THICKNESS OF FILL (TOP) CONTOUR LINE (DASHED WHERE INFERRED)

EASEMENT FOR BIKE PATH TO CITY OF TROY  
ROLL 127 FRAME 2106



NOTE:  
1.) THE LOCATIONS AND FEATURES DEPICTED ON THIS MAP ARE APPROXIMATE AND DO NOT REPRESENT AN ACTUAL FIELD SURVEY.  
MAP REFERENCE:  
1.) BOUNDARY SURVEY PREPARED BY C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C., DWG. NO. 01-564, DATED OCT. 8, 2001

DATE	REVISIONS RECORD/DESCRIPTION	DRAFTER	CHECK	APPR.	UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF SECTION 7209 SUBSECTION 2 OF THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION LAW.


**FIGURE 3**  
**SITE WIDE THICKNESS OF FILL**  
**CONTOUR MAP**  
**SOUTH TROY INDUSTRIAL PARK**  
**BROWNFIELDS INVESTIGATION**

CITY OF TROY RENSSELAER COUNTY, NEW YORK


**C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

30 CENTURY HILL DRIVE, P.O. BOX 727, LATHAM, NY 12110  
518.786.7400 • FAX 518.786.7299  
ARCHITECTURE & BUILDING SYSTEMS ENGINEERING • CIVIL ENGINEERING  
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES • SURVEY & LAND INFORMATION SERVICES

**FIG 3**  
SHEET 2 OF 4  
DWG. NO: 06-0139



- LEGEND**
- CTM SURFACE SOIL #11 C.T. MALE SURFACE SOIL SAMPLE
  - SB-211 C.T. MALE TEST BORING
  - CTM-9 WLE=13.27' C.T. MALE MONITORING WELL. WLE DENOTES WATER LEVEL ELEVATION IN FEET ABOVE MEAN SEA LEVEL
  - TP-1 C.T. MALE TEST PIT
  - GROUNDWATER CONTOUR LINE (DASHED WHERE INFERRED) BASED ON WATER TABLE DEPTHS MEASURED ON NOVEMBER 14, 2005 AND CONVERTED TO WATER TABLE ELEVATIONS BASED ON A BENCHMARK ELEVATION OF 24.92' MSL (NGVD1929). ARROW DEPICTS INFERRED DIRECTION OF GROUNDWATER FLOW.
  - MWA-W-1(STERLING) STERLING INVESTIGATION MONITORING WELL
  - MW-7(NORTH AMERICAN) NORTH AMERICAN INVESTIGATION MONITORING WELL
  - MW-3(ESI) EMPIRE SOILS INVESTIGATION MONITORING WELL



NOTE:  
1.) THE LOCATIONS AND FEATURES DEPICTED ON THIS MAP ARE APPROXIMATE AND DO NOT REPRESENT AN ACTUAL FIELD SURVEY.

MAP REFERENCE:  
1.) BOUNDARY SURVEY PREPARED BY C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C., DWG. NO.:05-104, DATED NOV. 30, 2004.

DATE	REVISIONS RECORD/DESCRIPTION	DRAFTED	CHECK	APPR.
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8			
	9			

UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF SECTION 7209 SUBDIVISION 2 OF THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION LAW.  
© 2006  
C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.

DESIGNED :  
DRAFTED : J.KARON  
CHECKED : N.FREEMAN  
PROJ. NO: 04.9138  
SCALE : 1"=100'  
DATE : JAN. 24, 2006

**FIGURE 4**  
**PARCEL 2 SHALLOW GROUNDWATER CONTOUR MAP (NOVEMBER 14, 2005)**  
**SOUTH TROY INDUSTRIAL PARK BROWNFIELDS INVESTIGATION**

CITY OF TROY RENSSELAER COUNTY, NEW YORK


**C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.**  
50 CENTURY HILL DRIVE, P.O. BOX 727, LATHAM, NY 12110  
518.786.7400 \* FAX 518.786.7299

ARCHITECTURE & BUILDING SYSTEMS ENGINEERING \* CIVIL ENGINEERING  
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES \* SURVEY & LAND INFORMATION SERVICES


**FIG 4**  
SHEET 3 OF 4  
DWG. NO: 06-0139

CAD DWG. FILE NAME: FIG4 SHALL GWC.DWG

CAD DWG. FILE NAME: FIG4 SHALL GWC.DWG



**LEGEND**  
 INDICATES 12" OF SOIL COVER.



**NOTE:**  
 1.) THE LOCATIONS AND FEATURES DEPICTED ON THIS MAP ARE APPROXIMATE AND DO NOT REPRESENT AN ACTUAL FIELD SURVEY.

**MAP REFERENCE:**  
 1.) BOUNDARY SURVEY PREPARED BY C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C., DWG. NO.:01-564, DATED OCT. 8, 2001.

DATE	REVISIONS RECORD/DESCRIPTION	DRAFTED	CHECK	APPR.
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
	8			
	9			

UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF SECTION 7209 SUBDIVISION 2 OF THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION LAW.  
 © 2006  
 C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.

DESIGNED :  
 DRAFTED : J. KARON  
 CHECKED : S. BIEBER  
 PROJ. NO: 04.9138  
 SCALE : 1"=200'  
 DATE : JAN. 24, 2006

**FIGURE 5  
 REMEDIAL MEASURES  
 LOCATIONS MAP  
 SOUTH TROY INDUSTRIAL PARK  
 BROWNFIELDS INVESTIGATION**

CITY OF TROY RENSSELAER COUNTY, NEW YORK

**C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES, P.C.**  
 50 CENTURY HILL DRIVE, P.O. BOX 727, LATHAM, NY 12110  
 518.786.7400 \* FAX 518.786.7299

ARCHITECTURE & BUILDING SYSTEMS ENGINEERING \* CIVIL ENGINEERING  
 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES \* SURVEY & LAND INFORMATION SERVICES

**FIG 5**  
 SHEET 4 OF 4  
 DWG. NO: 06-0139

CAD DWG. FILE NAME: FIG5.DWG

CAD DWG. FILE NAME: FIG5.DWG

# **APPENDIX A**

## **Responsiveness Summary**

# **RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY**

## **South Troy Industrial Park Environmental Restoration Site Rensselaer County, New York Site No. B00163**

The Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) for the South Troy Industrial Park site, was prepared by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) and was issued to the document repositories on February 10, 2006. The PRAP outlined the remedial measure proposed for the contaminated soil and groundwater at the South Troy Industrial Park site.

The release of the PRAP was announced by sending a notice to the public contact list, informing the public of the opportunity to comment on the proposed remedy.

A public meeting was held on February 28, 2006, which included a presentation of the Remedial Investigation (RI) and the Alternatives Analysis Report (AAR) as well as a discussion of the proposed remedy. The meeting provided an opportunity for citizens to discuss their concerns, ask questions and comment on the proposed remedy. These comments have become part of the Administrative Record for this site. The public comment period for the PRAP ended on March 27, 2006.

This responsiveness summary responds to all questions and comments raised during the public comment period. The following are the comments received, with the NYSDEC's responses:

Comment 1: Does Parcel 1 contain any grossly contaminated soil, and what will be done with it?

Response 1: Parcel 1 does not contain any grossly contaminated soil. The few soil samples analyzed in the tank removal area did not exceed soil cleanup guidelines.

Comment 2: If a better treatment method is proposed for soil and groundwater contamination, would it be considered during the design?

Response 2: Yes. The Record of Decision requires soil and groundwater to be treated, and indicates that multi-phase extraction is the "representative technology", for purposes of estimating the cost and duration of treatment. The specific method of treatment will be determined during the remedial design phase.

Comment 3: How does the NYSDEC know that there are not more buried tanks or drums buried at the site?

Response 3: Despite a thorough investigation of the site, the NYSDEC cannot rule out that other tanks or drums could be buried at the site. No evidence of leaking tanks or drums was found in soil and groundwater samples taken during the remedial investigation, or during previous investigations. The remedy relies on the Site Management Plan to prevent exposure to contaminants that may be

present but were not detected. This includes an evaluation of potential vapor intrusion exposures in new buildings to be constructed, and periodic monitoring of groundwater.

Comment 4: Was the large tank full of waste? How many gallons did it hold? Did it contain hazardous waste? What did the drum contain?

Response 4: The tank contained approximately 780 gallons of waste and contaminated water. The tank was designed to hold 1000 gallons. After the contents were analyzed, it was determined that the material was not a hazardous waste. The tank contents were mixed with decontamination water from the removal operation, and a total of 1,024 gallons of “non RCRA regulated material” were shipped off-site for disposal. Documentation of this work may be found in the February 16, 2005 "Summary of IRM Activities Report", which is on file in the project document repositories. The drum contained an ignitable hazardous waste (D001), similar to furniture stripper.

Comment 5: What specific contaminants were found at Parcel 3? Will the cleanup of “the Alamo” affect the cleanup of Parcel 3?

Response 5: Parcel 3 contained lower levels of contaminants in soil and groundwater than the other two parcels. Parcel 3 contained low levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and the metals arsenic, beryllium, copper, iron, mercury, nickel, selenium and zinc. The only contaminants that exceeded standards in groundwater were iron and manganese.

A remedy has not been proposed for the Alamo property, a distinct site adjacent to Parcel 3, so the NYSDEC cannot respond to this question at this time. However, since the remedy for Parcel 3 is a simple soil or asphalt cover, it is difficult to envision a scenario in which the cleanup for the Alamo would impact this remedy.

Comment 6: What are the plans for monitoring the 12" cover in the long term for erosion and other factors? Who would perform this monitoring?

Response 6: The soil cover and other elements of the remedy will have to be inspected and certified at a frequency of 1 to 3 years. The certification will be made by a licensed professional engineer or other qualified environmental professional who is found to be acceptable to the NYSDEC. These professionals are typically private environmental consultants hired by the property owner.

Comment 7: Has the industrial laundry adjacent to the site been investigated?

Response 7: No. However, groundwater monitoring wells located directly downgradient of the laundry facility on the County-owned property (southern portion of Parcel 1) did not contain any volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

Comment 8: What is State funding available for?

Response 8: State funding is available to reimburse municipalities for 90% of the costs for investigating and remediating contaminated properties that they own. Sites owned by private parties, and sites where municipalities are responsible for disposal of contaminants are not eligible for State funding.

Comment 9: Was the County Jail property cleaned up when it was built?

Response 9: The County Jail was not part of a remedial program overseen by the NYSDEC. However, the NYSDEC has information from test borings and test pits performed on the County Jail property in 1986 and 1990. This data is presented in the April 2004 "Historical Overview" report, which is available for public review in the document repositories. The data indicates that the only contaminants of concern are associated with the fill used to construct the site, and that petroleum, drums or tanks were not found on the property.

Comment 10: If a private party were to take ownership of the site, and later found another buried tank or drum, could they receive State funding to remove them?

Response 10: Provided that the land use is consistent with the restrictions established in the ROD, a private party who leases or purchases the site from the municipality would receive the same liability release and indemnification benefits of the Environmental Restoration Program. This includes NYSDEC remediation of contamination that was not discovered during the remedial investigation and not addressed by the ROD.

Comment 11: Could a future private owner of the site be held responsible for the costs of remediating the site?

Response 11: Provided that the future owner was not responsible for disposal of wastes, they would not be held liable for past remediation costs. As stated in Response #10, a future owner would receive the liability release and indemnification benefits from the municipality when it acquires the property.

Comment 12: Is 1 foot of cover protective of human health for use as a bike path?

Response 12: Yes.

---

Mr. Robert Smith, on behalf of Rensselaer County, submitted a letter dated March 8, 2006 with the following comment:

Comment 13: I note from my review of the PRAP that NYSDEC proposed to remediate the site to allow for "commercial, industrial and passive recreational use" thereof. It is the intention of the County of Rensselaer to acquire this site for purpose of expanding the existing Rensselaer County Jail facility located at 4000 Main Street. In view of the above, we would appreciate any clarification you can provide as to whether the intended use of the site as a jail facility falls within the scope of the proposed remediation.

Response 13: The use of a portion of the site as an inmate housing facility would be classified as a restricted residential land use. Ancillary uses to the jail on a separate parcel of the site, such as parking and equipment storage, would be considered as commercial use for the purpose of contaminant exposure and selecting a site remedy.

Based on the County's intention to construct a jail expansion on a portion of Parcel 1, the ROD has been revised to accommodate a possible restricted residential use. For the portion of the site with restricted residential use, the soil cover depth will be a minimum of 2 feet, except where components of the site development, such as buildings and pavement, cover the contaminants of concern. This portion of the site must be subdivided from the remainder, with a separate environmental easement that permits the restricted residential use.

# APPENDIX B

## Administrative Record

# **Administrative Record**

## **South Troy Industrial Park Site No. B00163**

1. Proposed Remedial Action Plan for the South Troy Industrial Park site, dated February 2006, prepared by the NYSDEC
2. “Historical Overview”, April 2004, prepared by C.T. Male Associates
3. “Site Investigation Work Plan”, June 2004, prepared by C.T. Male Associates
4. Fact Sheet, August 2004, Announcement of Site Investigation Start
5. “Fish and Wildlife Impact Assessment”, August 2004, prepared by C.T. Male Associates
6. “Summary of IRM Activities”, February 2005, prepared by C.T. Male Associates
7. “Remedial Investigation Report”, February 2006, prepared by C.T. Male Associates
8. “Alternatives Analysis Report”, February 2006, prepared by C.T. Male Associates
9. Fact Sheet, February 2006, Announcement of PRAP, Public Meeting and Comment Period
10. Letter dated March 8, 2006 from Mr. Robert Smith, Rensselaer County