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WELCOME project

• The WELCOME-project was funded by the European Union (FP5, EESD, EVK1-CT-2001-00103) and executed from January 2002 until December 2004

• 13 partners from 4 different EU member states and of different background; case study related end-users, research-institutes, universities, and consultants,

• interaction with an international group of end-users (see website: http://www.EUwelcome.nl/)

• Aiming at results with high research quality as well as with practical utility
WELCOME project

- Addressing groundwater, surface water and soil contamination on large (former) industrial sites:
  - Bitterfeld
  - Rotterdam and Antwerp harbour
  - Tarnowskie Gory

- Goal:
  - to make an Integrated Management Strategy (IMS) for Prevention and Reduction of risks at Contaminated Industrial Megasites for
  - Protection of groundwater and surface water resources in line with EU water framework and groundwater directives
WELCOME megasite cases

Protection of surface and groundwater resources according to the EU water framework and groundwater directives

Risk-based management for megasites

Position in river basin: Estuary | Middle | Spring area

- Rotterdam
- Antwerp
- Bitterfeld
- Tarnowskie Gory
EU Groundwater directive

• Establishes specific measures as set out in article 17 of the WFD in order to prevent and control groundwater pollution. Measures include:
  • Criteria for the assessment of good groundwater chemical status
  • Criteria for the identification and reversal of significant and sustained upward trends and the definition of starting points for trend reversal
  • Requirements to prevent or limit indirect discharges of pollutants into groundwater
• Annex IV, indent 1.4 (version submitted to the EU parliament)
  • Specific trend assessment shall be carried out for relevant pollutants in bodies of groundwater that are affected by point sources of pollution, including historical point sources, in order to verify that plumes from contaminated sites do not expand over a defined area and deteriorate the chemical status of the groundwater body.
• The IMS aims to take these EU requirements into account during building megasite management plans.
Integrated Management Strategy (IMS)

• Aimed at guiding the user through the whole process of establishing a megasite management plan; from the initial screening to the final definition of the remediation scenarios and long-term site management plan

• The IMS includes:
  • basic strategies of the IMS
  • a manual for technical experts and environmental managers
  • examples of the implementation of the IMS at the Welcome megasite cases
  • an overview of the technical support tools
Integrated Management Strategy

Introduction
- Problem definition
- Organizing stakeholders
- Boundary conditions
- Inventory of information
- Building a conceptual model
- Decision on IMS

Risk Assessment
- Megase: Characterization
- Clustering
- Modelling
- Determining risks
- Finalize clustering

Risk Management Scenarios
- Basic scenarios
- Potential and preferred scenario
- Final scenario

Implementation
- Management plan
- Monitoring program
- Review process

Definitions
- DC - Boundary conditions
- CN - Conceptual model
- GIS - Geographical Information System
- IMS - Integrated Management Strategy
- Megase:琪
- Plane of compliance
- RMZ - Risk Management Zone
- Stakeholders
Starting the IMS

1. Problem definition
2. Check if the site is a megasite
   - Yes: Start IMS
   - No:
     3. Organizing stakeholders
     4. Boundary conditions
     5. Inventory of information
     6. Building conceptual model
     7. GOS DECISION
        a. Risk-based approach is needed
        b. Risk management zone is delineated
     8. GOS agrees to continue with IMS
     9. GOS does not agree with the IMS approach
Risk assessment
Management scenarios

Diagram:

1. Building basic, cluster based RMS
2. GOS Decision
3. Check and update
4. Basic cluster based RMS
5. Iterative process
6. Set of Potential RMS
7. Cost-efficiency and Cost-benefit analysis
8. Set of Preferred megasite RMS
9. GOS Decision
10. Preferred megasite RMS
11. Optimization, technical detailing, final check
12. GOS Decision
13. Final megasite RMS

LEGEND:
- GOS: Group of stakeholders
- RMS: Risk Management Scenario
Implementation

- Goals
- Boundary conditions
- Effects of measures

Evaluation and adjustment of goals

Megasite Management Plan
Two megasites in the Netherlands and their relation to Regional Groundwater Bodies
Application the IMS to the Rotterdam harbour region
Starting the IMS 1: Organising stakeholders

• Stakeholders involved in steering group:
  • Port of Rotterdam (PoR)
  • Environmental Agency for Rotterdam region (DCMR)
  • Department of Environment (VROM)
  • Industry (united in the interest group Deltalinqs).
Starting the IMS 2: Conceptual model

Rotterdam megasite - planes of compliance - cross section

Polders

3rd plane of compliance

30 m

Pristine groundwater systems

15 Km

1st plane of compliance

Harbor

Sources

E1

E2

2nd plane of compliance

Aquifer below the harbor

Surface Water Systems
Risk assessment 1: megasite characterization

- Contaminant distribution
  - Availability of representative field data (from databases and industry)
  - Priority contaminants
  - Related to industrial activities
- Geohydrology
  - Regional scale
  - Complex soil stratification
  - Influence of heterogeneities (sand piles, groundwater extractions)
- Natural attenuation
  - Very important for long travelling times
  - Redox conditions
  - Biodegradation rates from representative field studies
- Prediction of fate and transport with model
  - Current and future impact at receptors
  - Uncertainty quantified in Monte-Carlo analysis
Result regional risk assessment Rotterdam Harbour

Rotterdam megasite - planes of compliance - cross section

- Possible Significant Effects on GWQ; time frame, 2020-2060. Contribution NA??
- Significant Effects on GWQ; time frame, 2005-2040
- No significant Effects on SWQ
Costs:
Mixed strategies: 15 to 20 M€/year
Compare: current expenditure 10 M€/year; full clean-up, 100 M€/year.
Effect of mixed strategy A
(impact on 2nd plane of compliance)

Scenario:
- Autonomous
- Mixed strategy A

15.7 M€/y

active measures start in 2005
Effect of mixed strategy A
(impact on 3rd plane of compliance)

- **Scenarios**
  - **Autonomous**
  - **mixed strategy A**

- **Active measures start in 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Mixed Strategy A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2065</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2085</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2095</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **15.7 M€/y**
Conclusion

• The WELCOME IMS

  • Is generic (attaching to national and EU regulations) and flexible (allowing for tailor-made region specific and iterative approaches)
  • Includes stakeholder participation and is based on natural science principles (establishing trends and appropriate measures using risk assessment procedures, fate and transport models, and taking into account natural attenuation and immobilisation processes)
  • Includes cost-indications
    • based on tools and practical engineering know-how,
    • to address the proportionality principle as mentioned in EU and national directives
  • May serve as a basis for further technical detailing of the groundwater directive with regard to management of large scale historical contaminations
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