

Beaudoin, Maurice NAE

From: Beauchemin, Timothy L NAE
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 1:03 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Beauchemin, Timothy L NAE; Beaudoin, Maurice NAE
Subject: RE: EPA Alternatives

Heather:

First, all of our excavations were over 2 feet deep and probably over 3 feet deep. Some went up to 14 feet deep.

Second, almost all excavations extended below the water table. There was a small area along one edge where we did not reach the water table, but we did hit a very dense glacial till.

I think that any chemical exceedences were below water table and therefore will be submerged in contaminated groundwater.

Timothy L. Beauchemin, P.E.
Project Manager
978-318-8616

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 12:25 PM
To: Beauchemin, Timothy L NAE
Subject: EPA Alternatives

Tim,

EPA's 'Preferred Alternative' in June of 2004:

SC 2b Assumes Adjacent Residence \$29.8 Million

Excavation and Off-Site Disposal of Radiological Contaminants, Dioxin and
PCB Contaminated Soils

With Capping of Remaining Contaminants (Chemicals and Heavy Metals).

Norton's 'Preferred Alternative':

SC 3b Assumes Adjacent Residence \$49.4 Million

Includes Excavation of All Wastes Exceeding Cleanup Levels and Disposal

Off-Site.

PRPs Proposed Alternative Now:

SC 2a Recreation, Without Adjacent Residence \$25.6 Million

(I Think!!!)

Excavation of Dioxin and PCB Contaminated Soils Exceeding Cleanup Levels

For Off-Site Disposal

Capping Remaining Contaminants

SC 3a Recreation, Without Adjacent Residence \$45.2 Million

Includes Excavation of All Wastes Exceeding Cleanup Levels and Disposal

Off-Site

This would have seemed reasonable.

But the point Melissa was making was that these 'Exceedances' "were at least 2 feet deep (mostly 3-8 feet depth) and do not pose an unacceptable risk since the Exposure Scenario has changed."

I take that to mean, if the Adjacent Residence was still there, this would/could not be proposed/recommended.

Also do not recall any agreement for exceedances (beyond cleanup criteria) being allowed or acceptable in any of the SC 3 Scenarios because they were "at least 2 feet deep".

This whole depth criteria is new to me!

I doubt Melissa even knows what the hell she is talking about! So in all fairness I should reserve judgment until ERM has an opportunity to (try and) make their case.

It understandable however why we are skeptical of this change/move.

EPA/PRPs would do as little or nothing at Shpack if we allowed it.

Hey, the Army Corps got rid of the really bad stuff.

And we are offering you a wildflower meadow!

Any suggestions or comments to help us through this are greatly appreciated.

Heather