From: Scott Jones
To: Miller, Garyg
Subject: RE: Another alternative for SJRWP complete removal?
Date: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 8:36:25 AM

Excellent. Thanks!

Scott

From: Miller, Garyg [mailto:Miller.Garyg@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 8:05 AM
To: sjones@galvbay.org
Subject: RE: Another alternative for SJRWP complete removal?

Yes Scott, the curtains were used during the installation of the TCRA cap & had a lot of problems, mainly with the currents/tides moving them around. And yes, there will be a significantly larger release for the full removal as described compared to the other alternatives. One of the required changes to the draft Feasibility Study is adding a new alternative for the northern waste pits to install an engineering control (may be a sheet pile, berm, or some other technology) to contain a much larger area while the dioxin containing material is removed. Not familiar with those other site, but will take a look at them.

Thanks for the comment.

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

From: Scott Jones [mailto:sjones@galvbay.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 4:29 PM
To: Miller, Garyg
Subject: Another alternative for SJRWP complete removal?

Hi Gary-
The complete removal alternative the RPs placed in the draft RF only calls for turbidity barrier/silt curtains. I am not 100% certain, but I don't think that will work and could make things worse for the river and the bay, even if it makes local residents feel better.

How about another alternative for complete removal that includes the building of containment levees or cofferdam and dewatering of the site and then removal. I am not an engineer and not sure if that is feasible, but hasn't that been done in the Hudson and Passaic rivers?

Thanks-
Scott

Scott A. Jones

Director of Advocacy
Galveston Bay Foundation
17330 Highway 3, Webster, TX 77598
281-332-3381 x209 (direct)
281-332-3153 (fax)
sjones@galvbay.org