

Table A-12.B. Evaluation factors

Remedial time frame	Concern
	Discussion
Safety	Concern
	Discussion
Waste management	Concern
	Discussion
Community concerns	Concern
	Discussion
Carbon footprint/energy requirements	Concern
	Discussion
Site restrictions	Concern
	Discussion
LNAPL body size	Concern
	Discussion
Other regulations	Concern
	Discussion
Cost	Concern
	Discussion
Other	Concern
	Discussion

s for in situ combustion/smoldering

Low
LNAPL source zone remediation on the scale of feet per day; process is scalable by increasing the number of ignition points operating at a time.
Moderate
Electrical equipment and cable on cable trays on the ground. High temperature in-well heaters used to initiate the process. Carbon monoxide emitted from the process. Combustion front is controllable via the supplied air flow (i.e., termination of the injected air terminates the reaction and stops the combustion front).
Very low
98-99% of remediated mass is destroyed via combustion in situ. No handling of LNAPL or other fluid above ground surface.
Moderate
Concern with technology that is unfamiliar to general public, particularly in regards to control of the speed and direction of the propagating combustion front. Potential concerns over odors and volatile emissions.
Very low
Self-sustaining process that uses the contaminants as the primary fuel source to drive the remediation process.
Moderate
Electric cables on the ground; subsurface utility concerns; vapor collection requirements.
Low
Best suited to large LNAPL bodies
Low
Permitting required for emissions
Low-moderate
Low energy demand makes smoldering cost-competitive, particularly for large-scale applications.