To: Gary Miller, P.E
EPA Region 6 Remedial Project Manager

FAX # 214 - 665 - 6660

Re: GulFco Marine Maintenance
SuperFund Site

640671

159976

EPA ID TXD055144539 Aug. 22, 2011
Site ID: 0602027 (1)

Re: As a healthcare professional for 29 yrs, a public health advocate since 2003 and a resident of Brazoria Co, I think its unaceptable and irresponsible to allow DOW Chemical and the other responsible parties to choose the Alternative #2. This alternative is a minimal action alternative that only requires monitoring of the contaminated superfund site annually. Respondents have contaminated water, soil and air @ the site. There is currently about 30 monitoring wells. The Alternative #2 allows them (respondents) to plug half the wells and eventually all the wells. The residents at Bridge Harbor, including the Casele Family that reported this Superfund Site in 2000 deserves a better alternative, a clean-up alternative (Alternative #3). The cost for the responsible parties will only be about $240,000, with the possibility of paying EPA costs - this only be about 1% per respondents including Dow Chemical. This is not

Aug. 22, 2011

(2)

a deterrent to keep DOW Chemical or others from creating other Superfund Sites. Example - DOW Chemical caused the Superfund/Contaminated site across from DOW B57 at the Slaughter Rd neighborhood and Freeport Golf Course. DOW refuses to pay Freeport for this contaminated golf course. There seems to be a pattern - DOW and others knowingly pollute an area with a "chemical soup" and only get a "slap on the wrist and a minimal cost ($$) Alternative. This is irresponsible of DOW and other respondents and is "irresponsible" of EPA to condone this behavior that directly affected for 20 yrs (+) residents health and well being and will continue to do so. EPA must require the responsible parties to take responsibility for their actions and be ordered to do Alternative #3 - the right thing!

Melanie Oldham
(979) 481-2723