

Table A-2.B. Evaluation factors for skimming

Remedial time frame	Concern	High
	Discussion	Long to very long. Depends on soil type, LNAPL type, release size, footprint, and end point (e.g., LNAPL thickness, sheen, or oil transmissivity goal). Low-permeability soils and heavier LNAPL require more time to remediate.
Safety concerns	Concern	Low
	Discussion	Potential release from primary containment into secondary containment. Overall skimmers represent a low safety risk.
Waste management	Concern	Low to moderate
	Discussion	Recovered LNAPL requires storage, treatment, disposal, and/or recycling. Incidental recovered water may need freeze protection in winter.
Community concerns	Concern	Low
	Discussion	Less concern with noise, aesthetic, and access issues and length of operation vs. other methods.
Carbon footprint/ energy requirements	Concern	Low to moderate
	Discussion	Carbon footprint depends on time frame, duration, frequency of events, and the amount of volatiles generated.
Site restrictions	Concern	Low
	Discussion	LNAPL skimming can usually be implemented in wells located around site restrictions.
LNAPL body size	Concern	Moderate to high
	Discussion	The size of the LNAPL body directly affects the cost and extent of the well network required to implement LNAPL skimming. Skimming ROI affects the number of wells required to address the LNAPL body.
Other regulations	Concern	Low
	Discussion	Proper storage of flammable/combustible liquids.
Cost	Concern	Low to moderate
	Discussion	Low for capital costs and low to medium for operation and maintenance, depending on life span of the project.
Other	Concern	
	Discussion	