
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 4:02 PM
To: Acone, Scott E NAE
Subject: Fwd: ERM's Response to Comments
Attachments: Response to Comments - 30% Design Report Working DRAFT 021512.pdf

Scott,

Passing this along (not just the ERM Response to Comments) but Melissa's reply to me, just in case Melissa or Garry didn't get the same to you yet.

Regards,

Heather

From: "MelissaG Taylor" <Taylor.Melissag@epamail.epa.gov>
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: "Garry Waldeck" <Garry.Waldeck@state.ma.us>, "Michael P. Last" <mlast@rackemann.com>, "John D'Agostino" <john.dagostino@erm.com>, "Michael Yunits" <myunits@nortonmaus.com>, "Jennifer Carlino" <conservation@nortonmaus.com>, "Leon Dumont" <healthagent@nortonmaus.com>, "Tim Giblin" <[REDACTED]>, "Bob Kimball" <[REDACTED]>, "Paul Schleicher" <schleicherp@nortonfire.com>, "Ron O'Reilly" <[REDACTED]>, "Garth Patterson" <Garth.Patterson@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 8, 2012 2:19:03 PM
Subject: Re: ERM's Response to Comments

Hi Heather,

I am forwarding ERM's response to comments in this email. However, there are still a couple of items we have yet to resolve, and we have a couple additional comments that we are waiting to hear an answer on, but for the most part, we are in agreement with ERM's proposal and their response to comments.

We are still debating what to do about the Lead exceedances at depth.

At other sites, institutional controls have been the way this issue is resolved and we are currently determining if that would be sufficient here given the depth of lead contamination in soil and the amount at which the cleanup level is exceeded. The institutional controls that we have planned for this site would be protective, as they require that no excavation takes place on site.

There are two dioxin exceedances that ERM did not propose to excavate and we told them that we wanted them excavated as they exceed the cleanup number of 1 ppb TEQ and are close to the surface.

Other than that, both EPA and DEP believe their approach makes sense and is protective of human health and the environment.

As far as the 100% design, I was going to wait until we met on the 2nd to give ERM the go-ahead to prepare the 100% design so I could get the town's input. ERM anticipates that they will begin work on the waterline this summer, as soon as the 100% design is approved, and will begin work on site once the Corps finalizes their Final Status Survey (which they have told us will be available in May), and transfers the site to the PRPs. As a side note, if for some reason EPA reviews the Final Status Survey and finds something egregious, I may require follow up with the Corps, which could, although unlikely, delay their transfer of the site to the PRPs.

Here is ERM's report. I will follow up with you once I have more clarity on EPA's position with respect to lead.

Thanks much,
Melissa

From: heathergraf1@comcast.net
To: MelissaG Taylor/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Garry Waldeck <Garry.Waldeck@state.ma.us>, "Michael P. Last" <mlast@rackemann.com>, John D'Agostino <john.dagostino@erm.com>, Michael Yunits <myunits@nortonmaus.com>, Jennifer Carlino <conservation@nortonmaus.com>, Leon Dumont <healthagent@nortonmaus.com>, Tim Giblin <[REDACTED]>, Bob Kimball <[REDACTED]>, Paul Schleicher <schleicherp@nortonfire.com>, Ron O'Reilly <[REDACTED]>, Garth Patterson <Garth.Patterson@mail.house.gov>
Date: 03/08/2012 12:01 PM
Subject: ERM's Response to Comments

Melissa,

Wondering how the meeting went on Tuesday March 6th, and what is the status of ERM's latest Response to Comments...

Do you and Garry Waldeck approve of the latest proposal for remediation?
(I assume that is what you are reviewing at this point).

Are you prepared to share ERM's response with us?

When can we expect the 100% Design?

When do you envision ERM beginning actual field work at the site again?

Thank you,
Heather