**To:** Peterson, Mary[Peterson.Mary@epa.gov]; McCoy, Erin[McCoy.Erin@epa.gov]; Rita A. Conner[raconner@dmgov.org]
**Cc:** Mills Brian (Safety)[brian.mills@titan-intl.com]; Mike Troyanovich[mike.troyanovich@titan-intl.com]; Damitio Jeremy (Legal)[jeremy.damitio@titan-intl.com]
**From:** GTSI
**Sent:** Fri 4/1/2016 5:37:17 PM
**Subject:** Visit

Thank you all for the visit on such bad weather. It was a pleasure meeting you all. I hope we can work on this project to benefit all parties involved and proudly remove an eye sore from a beautiful City to make it even better.
Titan is committed to this project if it can reach a fair outcome (to all parties) hence we need your help to assist DICO so that the proposals may be presented to the CEO and the Board of Directors for approval.

Once Mary and I define the project better, then we have the warm season to at least characterize the buildings to be readied for demolition & disposal (options). On the other hand, I agree with Mary and Erin that the buildings as a whole (except the office building) must be characterized for the Pesticides Aldrin, Di-Aldrin & PCB to insure proper disposal & avoid any future regulatory issues. I am also aware that before any demo action is taken that the contractor will survey for Asbestos as required by State & City Ordinances.

I understand Mary's concern about the source of PCB in the insulation being the infamous silver tape to attach to the beams or walls. The remedial firm/ Demolition Company can be advised by USEP to separate these tapes (PCB was a component of the glue) and test the insulation separately before disposal whereas the silver tape is isolated to be sent to a proper TSCA facility.

Mary's suggestion to involve the Region sampling team to conduct the characterization will insure that no delays are experienced due to the waiting period to approve a submitted sampling plan by an outside contractor. Please have Erin send me more details on this proposal specifically the projected costs associated with it.

DICO will maintain an onsite Remedial coordinator during the proposed cleanup (to completion) to effectively communicate with the EPA site coordinators

One final note regarding the OU4 South-pond: I urge you to review the EPA reports in the 1990's regarding the South Pond where "No further Remedial Actions" were required aside from the monitoring that was recently conducted by USEPA. After listening to Mary's explanation and the common realization that the buildings are at a lower elevation than the soils adjacent to the pond (as stated in the EPA records) , is obvious that the buildings did not contribute through storm water to the residues identified via initial sampling. I believe the contaminants that were found could have only resulted from the 1993 (and earlier) floods. I do not want to put the horse behind the cart so soon but I firmly believe that the South Pond should be discussed within the 3 Legal groups DICO, EPA & DOJ) since it was not part of DICO responsibility for the

past 2 1/2  decades but that of the DICHEM Customer group.

Thank you for your help and have a nice weekend

Respectfully

**GGeorge**

G. George, Ph.D

This message and any attachments are intended for the sole use of the intended recipient. It may contain confidential information. Any unauthorized use, dissemination, or modification is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and delete this e-mail from all your systems; do not copy, use, or print. Internet communications are not secure, and it is the responsibility of the recipient to make sure that they are virus exempt. The company/sender cannot be responsible for any unauthorized alterations or modifications made to the contents. If you require any form of confirmation of the contents, please contact the company/sender. The company/sender is not liable for any errors or omissions in the content of this message.