**From:** Ford, Mark
**To:** Ortiz, Diana; Patrick, Dwayne; Lane, Leticia
**Cc:** Moran, Gloria; Tzhone, Stephen
**Subject:** Grisham email Thursday May 14th
**Date:** Thursday, June 04, 2015 4:32:28 PM

---

All:

After a thorough discussion and deliberation, be advised that we will treat only a part of Mr. Grisham's email of Thursday May 14 (see below) to Stephen Tzhone under FOIA. That part is:

What are all the other "Final NPL" sites in Region 6 and their Hazard Ranking System "scores"?

Gloria Moran will be communicating with Mr. Grisham's counsel as to the remainder of the May 14th email as well as other emails and how the Region will be responding.

Any questions, please let me know.

Mark Ford
Senior Attorney/ORC
Superfund/FOIA

---

**From:** CC Grisham [mailto:grish@me.com]
**Sent:** Thursday, May 14, 2015 9:55 PM
**To:** Tzhone, Stephen
**Cc:** Charles Curtis Grisham Jr.; Kyle.Weaver@mail.house.gov; womack@mail.house.gov; adrielle.churchill@mail.house.gov; french.hill@mail.house.gov; katie.beck@governor.arkansas.gov; mpreston@arkansasedc.com
**Subject:** Arkwood Superfund Site, EPA ID: ARD084930148, Site ID: 06A3 - Request for information and official position

Dear Stephen:

I would like to request the following information please:

1) On September 17, 2013 U.S. Congressman Steve Womack's Projects Director Kyle Weaver wrote to EPA Region 6 Congressional Liaison LaWanda Thomas regarding Arkwood's "Site Score of 28.95 on the Hazard Ranking System" (please see attached):

**"Additionally, I find that the Arkwood site has the lowest Site Score for all Final NPL sites currently in EPA Region 6."**

Can you confirm that this statement was correct at that time and whether it is still the case? What are all the other "Final NPL" sites in Region 6 and their Hazard Ranking System "scores"?

2) Could EPA Region 6 Superfund summarize Arkwood's status in a one- or two-page précis that includes (but is not necessarily limited to) EPA's current position on the site with regard to: a) its prospects for future industrial use; b) the major steps planned to help realize those prospects or to rule them out, with timeline; c) the risk the site poses to human health and the environment; and d) remaining milestones that must be achieved before the site can be proposed for deletion from NPL, with timeline?

3) Sometime between September 17, 2013 and September 30, 2013, EPA Region 6 Congressional Liaison LaWanda Thomas provided responses to U.S. Congressman Steve Womack's Projects Director Kyle Weaver's inquiry (please see attached) which included the following statement:

**"Arkwood can return to productive use at any time, provided that the remedy is not compromised. The remedy that cannot be compromised consists of addressing the soil and groundwater to numerical cleanup goals as specified in the 1990 Record of Decision (and to be updated with the dioxin re-evaluation) and institutional controls."**

Could EPA please clarify and expand upon this statement?

4) On October 28, 2013 U.S. Congressman Steve Womack's Projects Director Kyle Weaver wrote to me (please see attached):

**"Congressman Womack's office noted to the EPA that this is an ongoing issue despite nearly 25 years working on it. Our office was assured that EPA is making an effort to expedite clean-up to reach the point of deletion from the NPL. Their response to our inquiry specifically said, 'This site is one of the earliest sites nationwide going through dioxin re-evaluation. EPA will work closely with the landowner, McKesson Corporation, and ADEQ to expedite the cleanup process.'"**

Can EPA confirm that the above assessment was an accurate characterization of EPA's intent with regard to Arkwood at the time of Mr. Weaver's writing? If so, has that intent changed since the time of Mr. Weaver's writing? Could EPA please reiterate and update its current position with regard to Mr. Weaver's questions and concerns contained in the full text of the Congressional inquiry and with reference to EPA responses from Ms. Thomas, as attached hereto?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Curt