Message

From: Juett, Lynn [Juett.Lynn@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/12/2019 7:03:37 PM
To: Mehta, Sandeep [mehta.sandeep@epa.gov]
CC: Fisher, Susan [Fisher.Susan@epa.gov]; Pessetto, Jared [Pessetto.Jared@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Vogel HQ mtg Jan2019 Rev one.ppt

Sandeep, unless Susan has any comments why don't you go ahead and send this to the participants on the meeting invitation. I will not have a chance to look at it today and it was in pretty good shape when I commented on it earlier.

Lynn M Juett
913-948-1129
Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 12, 2019, at 10:11 AM, Mehta, Sandeep <mehta.sandeep@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> Lynn:
>
> Good morning! I have attached the modified/corrected powerpoint. Jared and myself have finalized it. If you are ok, it can be sent to to HQ.
>
>
> To provide clarification to your question on item 3 below, I have to give two pieces of information:
>
> 1. Even if the RP meets the 2000 ESD conditions at the site boundary, they would be able to place the groundwater treatment system in a "standby" mode or operational maintenance mode. They can and most likely will stop pumping. However, the RP would also need to demonstrate the groundwater plume conditions continue to be met with sampling data from the plume. The frequency would be identified in the modifications that would happen to the monitoring plan, and would meet 2003 Consent Order conditions.
> 2. Having clarified the point 1, and knowing that the RP seems to believe (perception) that they can be "done" at the site, IDNR would most likely hold them to the 2003 Consent Order (attached here). The EPA can verify that during the RPM quarterly meeting so both managements can be on the same page.
>
>
> Respectfully
> Sandeep Mehta, P.E.
> Ph: (913) 551-7763
> Email: Mehta.sandeep@epa.gov
>
> [EPA icon]
>
> From: Juett, Lynn
> Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 3:52 PM
> To: Mehta, Sandeep <mehta.sandeep@epa.gov>
> Cc: Fisher, Susan <Fisher.Susan@epa.gov>; Pessetto, Jared <Pessetto.Jared@epa.gov>
> Subject: RE: Vogel HQ mtg Jan2019 Rev one.ppt
>
> Hi Sandeep – see below for answers to your questions.
>
> Thank You,
> Lynn M Juett
> Chief, Remediation Branch, Superfund Division
> US EPA Region 7
> 11201 Renner Blvd, Lenexa, KS 66219
> 913-551-7883 (desk)
> 913-948-1129 (cell)
> Juett.lynn@epa.gov<mailto:Juett.lynn@epa.gov>
>
> From: Mehta, Sandeep
> Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 12:12 PM
> To: Juett, Lynn <Juett.Lynn@epa.gov<mailto:Juett.Lynn@epa.gov>>
> Cc: Fisher, Susan <Fisher.Susan@epa.gov<mailto:Fisher.Susan@epa.gov>>; Pessetto, Jared <Pessetto.Jared@epa.gov<mailto:Pessetto.Jared@epa.gov>>
> Subject: RE: Vogel HQ mtg Jan2019 Rev one.ppt
> Importance: High
>
> Lynn:
>
> A few clarifications from your markup would help me.
>

> 1. I am not sure of what you want me to do with the markup in red on slides, 6, 8, 9. Can you please clarify this for me?[LMJ] - this red highlighting was in your original file sent to me, I did not change that.
> 2. The question related to slide 11: I have deleted the last bullet since the RP is working on it now.
> 3. The question related to slide 11: If the MCLs at site boundary are met, the 2000 ESD states: The existing groundwater monitoring plan will be revised to provide a groundwater monitoring strategy that will be used to verify that migration of contaminated groundwater from the site is not occurring. Revisions will include criteria to determine if, and when, discontinuation of active groundwater remediation (i.e., the ongoing pump and treat) is warranted. [LMJ] I understand the part about confirmation sampling to show that active gw remediation is no longer needed. I am confused about the ramification of meeting the cleanup criteria at the point of compliance (in this case the site boundary) which typically means that no further remedial action is needed. Is it your understanding that they plan to continue a remedial action of groundwater monitoring – and if so, when would they be done?
> What the implication for meeting the MCLs would be to shut down the pump & treat system, and there is no further need for any additional treatment since the plume has stabilized, and contained on site. The criteria in the monitoring plan would also need to clarify what happens if exceedances happen, and when the system would need to be turned on.
>
> After you clarify to point 1 above, I can send my mark up to Jared and have him review it.
>
> Respectfully
> Sandeep Mehta, P.E.
> Ph: (913) 551-7763
> Email: Mehta.sandeep@epa.gov<mailto:Mehta.sandeep@epa.gov>
>
> [EPA icon]
>
> From: Juett, Lynn
> Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 5:02 PM
> To: Mehta, Sandeep <mehta.sandeep@epa.gov<mailto:mehta.sandeep@epa.gov>>
> Cc: Fisher, Susan <Fisher.Susan@epa.gov<mailto:Fisher.Susan@epa.gov>>; Pessetto, Jared <Pessetto.Jared@epa.gov<mailto:Pessetto.Jared@epa.gov>>
> Subject: Vogel HQ mtg Jan2019 Rev one.ppt
>
> Hello Sandeep – I have made some edits to your presentation based on our discussion and added some comments for your response. Please revise accordingly and once you and Jared are good with the presentation, please send it back to me to add to the invitation for the discussion with HQ.
> <image001.jpg>
> <07-40088484 IDNR CO 2003.pdf>
> <Vogel HQ mtg Rev two 11Mar2019.ppt>