Message

From: Sutton, Douglas [dsutton@hgl.com]
Sent: 5/9/2017 1:48:12 PM
To: Rossi, Debra [Rossi.Debra@epa.gov]
CC: 'Susanna A. Mays' [susanna@trustsc.com]; Miller, Theresa [theresa_miller@golder.com]
Subject: RE: Spring PFA sampling
Attachments: 2017-04-28 FS Estimates Rev 7-NPV Plus ROD Summary.pdf

Debbie,

Please find attached an updated summary of the Alternative C costs that include estimated costs for treating manganese. Please note that these estimated costs for treatment of manganese with green sand were developed by Golder independently of AWC. AWC may decide to use another treatment method; therefore, the I would suggest that the RODA be flexible on the manganese treatment technology.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Doug

From: Rossi, Debra [mailto:Rossi.Debra@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2017 8:21 AM
To: Sutton, Douglas <dsutton@hgl.com>
Cc: 'Susanna A. Mays' <susanna@trustsc.com>; Miller, Theresa <theresa_miller@golder.com>
Subject: RE: Spring PFA sampling

Thank you very much, Doug. Would you please also provide estimated costs for manganese treatment in the Alternative C cost summary table. I expect that we will include this in the Discussion of Significant Changes section of the ROD Amendment.

Debbie

Debra Rossi
Remedial Project Manager
DE, VA, WV Remedial Branch (3HS23)
EPA Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 814-3228
rossi.debra@epa.gov

From: Sutton, Douglas [mailto:dsutton@hgl.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 10:01 AM
To: Rossi, Debra <Rossi.Debra@epa.gov>
Cc: 'Susanna A. Mays' <susanna@trustsc.com>; Miller, Theresa <theresa_miller@golder.com>
Subject: RE: Spring PFA sampling

Debbie,

The inclusion of the AOP and GAC costs in the DAA go back to mid-2014 when we collectively knew that treatment at the Llangollen well field would be part of the proposed remedy. Based on our discussions with EPA, the Trust understood

that EPA wanted the costs of that treatment included. AWC also asserted that it should be part of any remedial action and that its treatment costs should be addressed in any final resolution. Although AWC had filed for a rate increase in 2014, it did not receive approval of the rate increase for the AOP system until 2015. We believe that AWC would not agree that inclusion of its treatment costs in the rates should preclude its attempt to recover the costs.

The costs for manganese treatment were not included in the DAA because at that time, it was unclear that manganese treatment would be required. The cost summary that we recently provided to EPA in April 2017 was specifically designed to be consistent with our previous submittals. The Trust has estimated costs for manganese treatment and would be happy to provide those to EPA if requested.

Thanks,
Doug

From: Rossi, Debra [mailto:Rossi.Debra@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2017 7:58 AM
To: Sutton, Douglas <dsutton@hgl.com>
Cc: 'Susanna A. Mays' <susanna@trustsc.com>; Miller, Theresa <theresa_miller@golder.com>
Subject: RE: Spring PFA sampling

Thank you, Doug. I've been thinking about the Artesian treatment costs in the FS cost estimate for a while. It's not clear to me why costs for GAC and AOP are included, rather than costs for treatment to address manganese, It's EPA's understanding that Delaware's Public Service Commission approved, on at least two occasions, rate increases requested by Artesian to cover the costs of the AOP and GAC. Would you please provide additional information to clarify the cost component for treatment at the water supply wells?

Debbie

Debra Rossi
Remedial Project Manager
DE, VA, WV Remedial Branch (3HS23)
EPA Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 814-3228
rossi.debra@epa.gov

From: Sutton, Douglas [mailto:dsutton@hgl.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 8:22 AM
To: Rossi, Debra <Rossi.Debra@epa.gov>
Cc: 'Susanna A. Mays' <susanna@trustsc.com>; Miller, Theresa <theresa_miller@golder.com>
Subject: RE: Spring PFA sampling

Debbie,

I apologize for the delay. Golder has been focused on the bidding process for the LFG system. Please find attached the Alt C cost summary that you previously requested. I estimate that we should get you the PFAS sampling results next Wednesday.

Thanks,
Doug

From: Rossi, Debra [mailto:Rossi.Debra@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 12:10 PM
To: Sutton, Douglas <dsutton@hgl.com>
Subject: RE: Spring PFA sampling

Hi, Doug.

I have not received the PFAS sampling results. When may I expect them?

Thank you.

Debbie

Debra Rossi
Remedial Project Manager
DE, VA, WV Remedial Branch (3HS23)
EPA Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 814-3228
rossi.debra@epa.gov

From: Sutton, Douglas [mailto:dsutton@hgl.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 2:34 PM
To: Rossi, Debra <Rossi.Debra@epa.gov>
Cc: 'Susanna A. Mays' <susanna@trustsc.com>
Subject: Spring PFA sampling

Debbie,
During the upcoming spring sampling event at DS&G, the Trust proposes to perform a confirmatory round of PFA sampling (i.e., the same as was conducted in October of last year). Based on the findings from both rounds of sampling, the Trust will recommend a PFA sampling program for the 2017 October event.

Rather than generate another document to formalize this approach, I thought it would be appropriate to include the above approach as a recommendation in the PFA addendum that Golder will be forwarding to you shortly to convey the October 2016 PFA sampling results.
Please let me know if this is acceptable to you.
Thanks,
Doug

Doug Sutton, Ph.D., PE, LEED AP
Principal Engineer
HydroGeoLogic, Inc.
Cell: 732-233-1161

Consider the Environment before printing this email.

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This electronic communication, including any attached documents, may contain confidential or legally privileged information intended only for recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are prohibited from disclosing, reproducing, distributing or otherwise using this transmission. If you received this communication by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and delete the communication and any attachments.