

**Asimakis P. Iatridis**

---

**From:** <Rkrumb@aol.com>  
**To:** <miatridis@hannonlaw.com>  
**Cc:** <lhavelic@mines.edu>; <jspencer@techangle.com>; <smcuffin@worldnet.att.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 21, 2003 7:27 AM  
**Subject:** FS Potetial Alternative Screening Criteria

Maki:

In response to your question regarding the guidance documents and/or process used to to select or exclude potential alternatives at the screening level, please find the following:

The primary document that we used is titled "Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA", EPA/540/G-89/004, OWSER Directive 9355.3-01. The document was published as Interim Final in October 1988, and was never published as "Final". However, it is still the primary document that is used for the process. There are also published fact sheets describe the process such as "The Feasibility Study: Development and Screening of Remedial Action Alternatives", OS-220 Directive 9355.3-01FS3, November 1989.

When technologically feasible alternatives are found, then the final process is typically to use cost and/or ARARs to further reduce the possible list of actions. Depending on the list of possible options, these may be scored or weighed. It is also possible that the technologically feasible options list is limited to one process with variations (i.e., off-site disposal), then you pick based on cost. This is the process that was followed at the alternative screening level.

Please call with additional questions.

Robert Krumberger  
New Horizons Environmental Consultants, Inc.  
(303) 647-1055 phone  
(303) 647-2301 fax  
[rkrumb@aol.com](mailto:rkrumb@aol.com)