From: Miller, Garyg
To: Turner, Philip
Subject: RE: spoke to Jennifer
Date: Friday, January 10, 2014 5:06:00 PM

Phil,

Including a comment with the other FS comments makes sense, and then the PRPs would respond in a response to comments, or perhaps a separate tech memo – I will discuss that w/ David K. Either way, we need some comment language that captures what we (and HQs) want; can you put something together like that & I will add it to the FS comments?

Thanks,

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

From: Turner, Philip
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2014 4:33 PM
To: Miller, Garyg
Subject: spoke to Jennifer

Hi Gary,

I spoke with Jennifer, and gave her the heads up about bolstering the defense of the 0.5 RBA. We are assuming that their response will come as an attachment to the response to comments for the FS. Since the PCLs in the FS are what raised this issue with HQ, I'm thinking the RBA comments from us will be with our comments on the FS. IF we would like them to provide a separate memo bolstering the RBA, then we need to let them know.

BTW, the sediment PCL to protect the Subsistence Fisher was calculated to be 110. This is for dioxins and furans. There are others for PCBs, Arsenic and Mercury.

The fish tissue PCL (DFs) to protect the subsistence fisher was 0.44

The clam tissue PCL (DFs) to protect the subsistence fisher was 6.7

Phil