

From monitoring to measures: Historical contaminated sediments in the Elbe river basin

Ulrich Förstner¹, Susanne Heise², Peter Heininger³

¹Technical University Hamburg, D-21071 Hamburg, Germany

Phone: +49 (0)40 42878-4171

²BIS at the TUHH, D-21071 Hamburg, Germany

E-mail: u.foerstner@tu-harburg.de

³Federal Institute of Hydrology, Am Mainzer Tor 1, D-56068 Koblenz, Germany

Introduction: Sediment management under the EU Water Framework Directive will need a wider scope with *in situ* technologies embedded in a modern system of risk assessment and communication on the river basin scale. A new initiative for Europe-wide activities in the field of sediment management technology could start in the course of the forthcoming strategies against chemical pollution of surface waters (WFD article 16), i.e. establishment of a program of measures until 2009 for sources of priority substances including the specific source/pathway “historical pollution from sediment”¹. In the view of the size of the problems in Europe², the guidance to innovative remedial measures and the experience from successful problem solutions in the United States cannot be ignored³. Our presentation refers to chapter 6 “Risk reduction of contaminated sediments in the Elbe river basin” in a study on behalf of the Hamburg Port Authority and River Basin Community of the Elbe⁴.

Methods: The different objectives of risk assessment and monitoring on solid material involve specific techniques favoring different media (suspended particulate matter, sediments, biota)⁵: (i) Surveillance, i.e., source screening and preliminary site characterization; (ii) survey, i.e., identification of anomalies and basic characterization on the regional to river basin scale; (iii) mass balances, including “weight of evidence”-approaches (see abstract by Heise et al.⁶). A fourth sediment monitoring issue under the WFD will be assessing risks and functioning of measures, in particular, monitoring before and after remediation of contaminated sediments. In this field, initial recommendations have been presented in a guidance document of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency⁷ and for remediation dredging by the U.S. National Research Council⁸: How to assess and monitor the five “R’s” – the risks arising from residuals, resuspension, release and recontamination? U.S. focus is on remediation dredging, in-situ capping and monitored natural recovery (MNR); these technologies all rely on contaminant source control; monitoring programs should include multiple lines of evidence that include chemical, physical, geotechnical, and biological metrics, and modelling in order to evaluate, with adequate certainty, the effectiveness of the chosen approach at a site^{9,3}.

Results: The examples from the upper Elbe River catchment give special emphasis on the utilization of geochemically-based technology for sediment remediation, which can be applied in different parts of a river basin¹⁰. For a yachting harbor, a draft approval has been made which involves a patented excavation procedure; monitoring of the subaqueous depot with an active barrier system was performed using dialysis sampler and diffusional gradient technique probes¹¹. The MNR potential is assessed according to typical lines of evidence, e.g., contamination burial, mechanical and chemical mobility, transformation to less toxic forms and dilution due to dispersion⁷. Although strict criteria are not fulfilled in many floodplains of the Elbe river catchment area, it can be stated that the alluvial soils offer a high natural retention potential for a wide spectrum of contaminants¹². In the historical contamination of the Mulde river, the high concentration of PCCD/F’s and their low degradation potential is the limiting factor for applying MNR¹³.

References: [1] Expert Advisory Forum on Priority Substances and Pollution Control, CIS/WFD, Concept Paper 7th EAF Meeting, June 2004; [2] Bortone (2007) *Sediment and Dredged Material, Sustainable Management of Sediment Resources*. Vol 2, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 222 p; [3] Förstner and Aplitz (2007) *J Soils Sediments* 7:381-388; [4] Heise et al. (2007) *Assessment of Risks from Particle-bound Pollutants in the Elbe River Basin*, Draft September 2007; [5] Förstner et al (2008) Chapter 8.3 in: Borchers et al. (Eds) *The Water Framework Directive – Ecological and Chemical Monitoring*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester (in prep.); [6] Heise et al. this conference; [7] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2005) *Contaminated Sediment Remediation Guidance for Hazardous Waste Sites*. EPA-540-R-05-012. Washington DC; [8] National Research Council (2007) *Sediment Dredging at Superfund Megsites*. The National Academic Press, Washington DC, 236 p; [9] Ivison et al. (2007) in: Foote and Gregory (Eds) *Proc 4th Int Battelle Conf on Remediation of Contaminated Sediments*, Savannah/GA, ISBN 978-1-57477-159-6; [10] Förstner (2003) *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 10, 58-68; [11] Jacobs (2003) *J Soils Sediments* 3, 100-107; [12] Schwartz et al. (2006) *J Soils Sediments* 6, 145-155; [13] Bunge et al. (2007) *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 14, Special Issue 1 (2007), 3-10.