Message

From: Shewmake, Kenneth [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5031C1ABFE8847809A448EF4899DE65C-SHEWMAKE, KENNETH]
Sent: 3/11/2019 3:33:57 PM
To: Rebecca Storms [Rebecca.Storms@Tceq.Texas.Gov]
Subject: RE: Draft SAP revisions

Did you have a contact person with DISD or the middle school when you were doing sampling at the site? Our site attorney is working on an access agreement and is trying to determine who she should contact.

From: Rebecca Storms <Rebecca.Storms@Tceq.Texas.Gov>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 8:25 AM
To: Shewmake, Kenneth <shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft SAP revisions

Kenneth,

I've attached the markup I sent to you and EA after our SAP comments conference call. It shows the general area of where the rectangular depression that has been observed filled with water is located. Please see attached markup and email with EA on this.

Please let me know if you need to discuss anything else.

Thanks,
Rebecca

From: Shewmake, Kenneth <shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 3:47 PM
To: Rebecca Storms <Rebecca.Storms@Tceq.Texas.Gov>
Cc: Pereira, Stephen <pereira.stephen@epa.gov>; Sharon Barker <Sharon.Barker@tceq.texas.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft SAP revisions

Rebecca,

Can you provide more information on comment 2 or mark the location on a figure?

Kenneth Shewmake
US Environmental Protection Agency
Environmental Scientist
RPM Lane Plating

1445 Ross Ave., Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202-2733
shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov
work phone- (214) 665-3198

From: Rebecca Storms <Rebecca.Storms@Tceq.Texas.Gov>
Sent: Friday, March 08, 2019 2:47 PM
To: Shewmake, Kenneth <shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov>

Cc: Tsui-Bowen, Alethea <Tsui-Bowen.Alethea@epa.gov>; Rauscher, Jon <Rauscher.Jon@epa.gov>; Pereira, Stephen <pereira.stephen@epa.gov>; Malott, Vincent <malott.vincent@epa.gov>; Sharon Barker <Sharon.Barker@tceq.texas.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft SAP revisions

Hi Kenneth,

Please see our thoughts below, and let me know if you'd like to discuss. I am leaving for the day but will be back on Monday. Otherwise, we look forward to reviewing the formal revised SAP.

Revised soil sample locations (Figure A-2/Table A-2)

1. TCEQ comment 7(b) and eco attachment comment 3; TCEQ recommends one of the following options below:
    a. Sample depth rearrangement option (switching 15-ft/refusal depth with 5-ft depth): TCEQ recommends adding DSB-7 and DSB-9 (instead of JSB-1) to the list of borings that will be sampled from 2 to 5 feet instead of 15 feet or refusal. These locations are close to the facility and more likely to be C/I than Residential. Likewise, JSB-1 is more likely to be Residential than DSB-9. With the above changes, TCEQ would be ok with the suggested boring designations that will be sampled from 2 to 5 feet instead of 15 feet or refusal, but would request the following acknowledgement to be added to the SAP: that if contamination in these borings is not delineated by 5 feet, additional soil samples will be collected in Phase 2. Likewise, for all other borings, if contamination is not delineated by 2 feet, additional soil samples will be collected in Phase 2.

    b. *Alternative and preferred option: TCEQ recommends keeping the original 3 sampling depths in all borings for consistency (0-0.5, 0.5-2, and 15 ft or refusal), but adding a fourth depth from 2-5 ft in the following borings: DSB-2, DSB-5, DSB-7, DSB-8, DSB-9, JSB-1 through JSB-4. This can be done by taking out the reserved DSB-10 through DSB-12 boring locations and associated 9 samples, and using the funding for these samples to apply to the fourth depth at select borings instead. This may prevent the need for additional vertical delineation in future sampling events.

2. TCEQ comment 26(a):
    a. We discussed with EA that one of the planned soil borings in the rectangular depression filled with water area would be shifted to assess this feature (DSB-5, DSB-6, DSB-7 area). Is this still the plan, and will the revised SAP discuss this)?

Revised GW sample/MW locations

1. TCEQ comment 24(a):
    a. TCEQ recommends adjusting the revised MW-1 location to the vicinity of previous soil sampling grids E6 or G5 (location of consistent RSL exceedances at mid-depths). If placed in the vicinity of grid E6, suggest placing between grids E6 and E7 or E6 and D6.

2. Additional comments/questions:
    a. Will facility wells be surveyed to allow use in groundwater elevation determination?
    b. Flush mount vs. stick-up: TCEQ advises that the field area near the small pond is prone to flooding (proposed location of MW-3).

Thanks,
Rebecca

From: Shewmake, Kenneth <shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 4:47 PM
To: Rebecca Storms <Rebecca.Storms@Tceq.Texas.Gov>
Cc: Tsui-Bowen, Alethea <Tsui-Bowen.Alethea@epa.gov>; Rauscher, Jon <Rauscher.Jon@epa.gov>; Pereira, Stephen

<pereira.stephen@epa.gov>; Malott, Vincent <malott.vincent@epa.gov>
Subject: FW:

Here are some revised figures and a table from our contractor based on comments on the Draft SAP for Lane plating . Let me know if you have any comments.

Kenneth Shewmake
US Environmental Protection Agency
Environmental Scientist
RPM Lane Plating

1445 Ross Ave., Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202-2733
shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov
work phone- (214) 665-3198

From: Paddack, Mark <mpaddack@eaest.com>
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2019 1:50 PM
To: Shewmake, Kenneth <shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov>
Subject:

Mr. Shewmake:

As I had mentioned, attached are figures mark-ups showing sample locations that were shifted per EPA and TCEQ comments. once you have the chance to look these over, please let me know your thoughts, and I get formal revisions completed. If you recall, TCEQ also had two separate comments regarding sampling depths for soil borings, and as we discussed during the 20 February 2019 call, I shifted some of the from a portion of the boring location where the 2 to 5 feet interval will be sampled, versus the 15 feet as originally planned. I have included a copy of the revised Soil Sample Design Matrix tables that illustrates which soil boring locations will be sampled down to a total depth of 15 feet versus 15 feet.

Please let me know if you have questions or comments concerning this matter.

Thank You,
Mark Paddack
EA Project Manager