PUBLIC RECORDS / WORKED EXAMPLE

Shieldalloy: a proposal or a final remedy?

Environmental diligence

Prepared by Dossier Editorial | November 10, 2026

EVIDENCE SOURCES	EVIDENCE CHECKED	PUBLISHER INSTITUTIONS
7	2026-11-10	3

SECTIONS	READER QUESTIONS	REVIEW SCOPE
7	4	Public records

EVIDENCE CHECKED	2026-11-10
EDITION	1 | Public-source research
ARTICLE	dossierplus.ai/blog/shieldalloy-superfund-proposed-plan-record-of-decision

IMPORTANT USE NOTE

Dossier Editorial prepared this educational case study with AI assistance using public records. No private matter, platform investigation, independent field sampling or human legal review was involved. The PDF uses the same findings and sources.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JA4R-5HCK-YWWS · Seal 456A38CE4AA4 · SHA-256 BE0B39F6279397EB · Issued 2026-11-10 17:10 UTC

PART 01

The decision in brief

No. On November 9, 2026, EPA asked for public comment on its preferred way to address perchlorate in groundwater at the Shieldalloy site in New Jersey. The state agreed with that choice. EPA's plan says the agency can still change it after considering comments. The document to look for is a Record of Decision for Operable Unit 3, the part of the site investigation that covers perchlorate.

Publication date: November 10, 2026. Historical event dates are identified separately. This PDF and the article use the same structured source selection and findings.

PART 02

What can a property reviewer put in the file today?

Record "EPA prefers Alternative 2; New Jersey concurs; final selection not verified." Alternative 2 would rely on natural processes to lower perchlorate concentrations. It also calls for investigation before design, monitoring to see whether the approach works, controls on groundwater use, and treatment at the point of entry if needed. The state's November 6 letter supports those elements. On November 9, EPA invited comments on all the options. [S1] [S6] [S2]

A reviewer might already have a document titled Record of Decision for Shieldalloy groundwater. The September 1996 decision is real, but its cover says OU 01. It addressed metals and volatile organic compounds. It cannot answer whether EPA selected a perchlorate remedy in 2026. Keep the contaminant and unit number beside the site name wherever the conclusion will be reused. [S3] [S1] [S4]

PART 03

Match the site, the water and the unit

Use EPA site ID NJD002365930. This is the former Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation facility in Newfield Borough, with part of the site in Vineland, New Jersey. The groundwater under investigation is distinct from water delivered to a building. A monitoring well measures the aquifer at a particular location and depth; a utility connection describes how a property receives water. [S5] [S1]

EPA split the work into three operable units. OU1 covers groundwater contaminants other than perchlorate. OU2 covers non-perchlorate contamination in soil, sediment and surface water. OU3 investigated perchlorate across several media; EPA's proposed action concerns groundwater. Plumes can overlap on a map without making the earlier decision applicable to the later contaminant. [S1] [S4]

PART 04

Read the records in decision order

DATE	WHAT THE RECORD SAYS	WHAT IT ESTABLISHES
Sept 24, 1996	NJDEP selected a groundwater remedy for OU1 with EPA concurrence.	An earlier final decision with a different scope. [S3] [S4]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JA4R-5HCK-YWWS · Seal 456A38CE4AA4 · SHA-256 BE0B39F6279397EB · Issued 2026-11-10 17:10 UTC

DATE	WHAT THE RECORD SAYS	WHAT IT ESTABLISHES
2014 and 2015	EPA recorded the OU2 decision on Sept 25, 2014 and the OU1 amendment on Sept 30, 2015.	Neither entry selects an OU3 remedy. [S4] [S1]
October 2026	Geosyntec's study for Shieldalloy compared four OU3 options.	An engineering comparison prepared for the company. [S7]
Nov 6, 2026	NJDEP signed a letter concurring with Alternative 2.	State support for the proposal. [S6]
Nov 9, 2026	EPA opened comments on its plan and scheduled a Nov 19 meeting.	A public participation step. The meeting was still ahead at this review. [S1] [S2]

PART 05

Two numbers to keep out of the wrong column

Cost: $1,856,500 is the estimated present value of Alternative 2 over 30 years. The feasibility study used a 7% discount rate and lists $641,000 in capital costs. Its comparison table expressly excludes the pre-design investigation, even though the proposed remedy includes that work. The table compares options. It does not give an all-in contract price, establish who owes that amount, or document a payment. [S7] [S1]

Water quality: EPA's proposed groundwater goal is 5 micrograms of perchlorate per liter. Figure 4 labels monitoring well SC-1D at 24 micrograms per liter on October 9, 2024. Those are different kinds of numbers: a proposed goal and a historical measurement. The plan estimates 20 to 30 years to reach its objectives. Neither figure tells a buyer what came out of a particular tap on November 10, 2026. [S1]

The alternative labeled "No Action" does not include monitoring or well controls. Alternative 2 does. EPA also compared pumping and treating groundwater and treating it in place. New Jersey's agreement is documented, but community acceptance and EPA's final selection are separate questions. The schedule showed an estimated decision window, not an issued OU3 decision. [S1] [S4] [S6] [S7]

PART 06

Which claim are you being asked to verify?

1. IS THE RECORD ABOUT THIS UNIT AND CONTAMINANT?

- If established: Match the site ID, OU3 and perchlorate. Then read the document title and decision language.
- If unresolved: File an OU1 or OU2 decision under its own unit. A matching address is insufficient.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JA4R-5HCK-YWWS · Seal 456A38CE4AA4 · SHA-256 BE0B39F6279397EB · Issued 2026-11-10 17:10 UTC

2. HAS EPA MADE ITS FINAL SELECTION?

- If established: Read the signed OU3 Record of Decision, its selected alternative and response to comments. Check for later amendments.
- If unresolved: Record the preference, state concurrence and public comment stage separately. A folder labeled “ROD” can contain documents gathered before the decision.

3. HAS SPENDING OR CLEANUP PERFORMANCE BEEN VERIFIED?

- If established: For spending, reconcile authorized costs with dated payment records. For performance, compare quality-checked samples against the applicable goal at matched wells and depths.
- If unresolved: Retain the estimate, forecast or old measurement with its date. Leave actual payments and current water quality open.

PART 07

Reproduce this review in Dossier

- Create a public-source case for EPA site NJD002365930. Add three questions: What did EPA propose for OU3? Has it selected a remedy? What shows that the groundwater goal has been met?
- Attach the proposal, NJDEP letter, original OU1 decision and engineering study as distinct sources. Save the site schedule and news notice with retrieval dates. Label Geosyntec as the study author and Shieldalloy as its client; EPA hosts the copy.
- Create separate timeline entries for the state letter and EPA’s announcement. In the cost finding, attach study section 5.5.7 and retain the pre-design exclusion. In the water finding, attach Figure 4 and record the well, units and sample date.
- Export the findings with a separate status for each question. A second reader should be able to reproduce the preferred alternative, identify why the OU1 decision was set aside, and locate the evidence still needed for an OU3 outcome. [S1] [S3] [S5] [S6] [S7]

PART 08

What evidence would change the conclusion?

For final selection, look for EPA’s signed OU3 Record of Decision and its response to public comments. For implementation, obtain the design and evidence that the specified controls took effect. For performance, seek dated monitoring results under that design. A property-specific water question also needs a verified supply source and relevant sampling; this case study does not assess an individual property. [S1] [S4]

One small discrepancy matters to anyone following the public process: EPA’s news release gives December 9 as the mail postmark date. The proposed plan gives December 11, and both list December 11 as the end of the comment period. Preserve both statements and check EPA’s current instructions before relying on a mailing date. This review found no basis to treat the two dates as interchangeable. [S1] [S2]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JA4R-5HCK-YWWS · Seal 456A38CE4AA4 · SHA-256 BE0B39F6279397EB · Issued 2026-11-10 17:10 UTC

PART 09

Questions readers ask

DOES THE STATE'S SIGNED LETTER MAKE ALTERNATIVE 2 FINAL?

No. The letter agrees with the proposed alternative. EPA's plan reserves the final choice until after it considers public comments. [S6] [S1]

IS MONITORED NATURAL ATTENUATION THE SAME AS DOING NOTHING?

No. The no-action option provides no monitoring. The preferred option calls for checking how concentrations change, restricting groundwater use and adding point-of-entry treatment if needed. [S1] [S7]

WAS $1,856,500 AWARDED OR PAID FOR THE CLEANUP?

The records reviewed establish a discounted engineering estimate. They do not establish an award, invoice or payment. The study also excludes pre-design investigation costs from its comparison table. [S7] [S1]

CAN THE OLDER GROUNDWATER DECISION SETTLE A QUESTION ABOUT OU3?

No. The 1996 cover identifies OU1, and the 2026 proposal distinguishes its non-perchlorate groundwater work from OU3. Use the unit-specific decision for the question at hand. [S3] [S1]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JA4R-5HCK-YWWS · Seal 456A38CE4AA4 · SHA-256 BE0B39F6279397EB · Issued 2026-11-10 17:10 UTC

PART 10

Linked source register

Titles with a recorded URL link to that source. Entries without a URL identify retained material but do not open an original file. For any court or business record being used in litigation, obtain a certified copy directly from the clerk or filing authority and preserve the retrieval date.

S1 **Shieldalloy OU3 proposed plan**
Proposed remedy. Anchor: Nov 9, 2026, pp. 1–3, 8–9, 13–15, 20–21 and Figure 4. Distinguishes alternatives, measured concentrations, cost assumptions and the decision still to come. · retrieved 2026-11-10

S2 **EPA announces public comment on the Shieldalloy plan**
Agency notice. Anchor: Nov 9, 2026, proposal, meeting and comment instructions. Its December 9 mail instruction differs from the plan's December 11 postmark date. · retrieved 2026-11-10

S3 **1996 groundwater Record of Decision, OU 01**
State remedy selection, EPA concurrence. Anchor: PDF cover and Declaration for the Record of Decision, pp. 5–6. Identifies the first groundwater unit and treatment of metals and volatile organic compounds. · retrieved 2026-11-10

S4 **Shieldalloy cleanup schedule by operable unit**
Site milestone register. Anchor: Site milestones and OU 01, 02 and 03 decision rows. Actual entries and planning estimates have different status. This register can change. · retrieved 2026-11-10

S5 **Shieldalloy site documents and administrative records**
Official site and record index. Anchor: Administrative Records and Site Data, EPA ID NJD002365930. The OU3 collection title identifies a file, not the issuance of a final remedy. · retrieved 2026-11-10

S6 **NJDEP's concurrence with the OU3 proposal**
Signed state letter. Anchor: Nov 6, 2026, p. 1, subject and preferred remedy components. State concurrence applies to the proposed alternative and its conditional treatment provisions. · retrieved 2026-11-10

S7 **Final OU3 focused feasibility study**
Engineering study prepared for Shieldalloy. Anchor: October 2026 cover; sections 5.2.7 and 5.5.7, PDF pp. 37 and 57. Specifies the discount rate and the pre-design cost exclusion. Final describes the study, not a decision by EPA. · retrieved 2026-11-10

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JA4R-5HCK-YWWS · Seal 456A38CE4AA4 · SHA-256 BE0B39F6279397EB · Issued 2026-11-10 17:10 UTC