Message

**From**: Yap-deffler, Yazmine [Yap-Deffler.Yazmine@epa.gov]
**Sent**: 3/24/2017 11:44:01 AM
**To**: Hirsh, Steven [Hirsh.Steven@epa.gov]
**Subject**: FW: Bishop Tube Site

Also need to talk to you about this

Thanks,
Yaz

Yazmine J. Yap-Deffler, Acting Chief
Site Assessment & Non-NPL Federal Facilities Branch (3HS12)
US EPA Region III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-814-3369 (Office)
267-761-2089 (Cell)
yap-deffler.yazmine@epa.gov

---

**From:** Brown, Kinshasa
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 2:16 PM
**To:** Yap-deffler, Yazmine <Yap-Deffler.Yazmine@epa.gov>
**Subject:** FW: Bishop Tube Site

fyi

Sasha Brown
Pennsylvania State & Congressional Liaison
U.S EPA Region III
1650 Arch St. (3CR00)
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Brown.Kinshasa@epa.gov
215-814-5404

---

**From:** M. P. Tomei [mailto:MPTOMEI@senatepa.com]
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 10:47 AM
**To:** Brown, Kinshasa <Brown.Kinshasa@epa.gov>
**Subject:** Re: Bishop Tube Site

Hi Sasha,

Thank you for the timeline. I have some additional questions in red below. Will you be able to provide me with this information? Do you have any information on why nothing has been done at this extremely toxic site for close to 30 years?

Thanks,
MP Tomei

---

**From:** Brown, Kinshasa <Brown.Kinshasa@epa.gov>
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 9:23 AM
**To:** M. P. Tomei
**Subject:** RE: Bishop Tube Site

Here's the information on the Bishop Tube site. Also attached is a 2015 Site Update summarizing the response actions at Bishop Tube.

**Bishop Tube Timeline**

**8/1/1980 –** EPA site discovery as reported in SEMS (what is SEMS?)

**11/1/1983 –** EPA's Preliminary Assessment (Can I see a copy of this or better yet, a copy of the removal assessment that occurred you mention below ?)

**6/25/1985 –** EPA's Site Inspection – Higher Priority for further assessment (Is there a record of this? What does *higher priority* mean above when it seems it took 10 years to get back to it. I guess I am asking if the "higher priority" means something different in this context? I recall that even under President Regan in 85, there was an increase in Hazardous site clean up funding, so would like to see any documentation for this assessment.)

**1/13/1995** – EPA's Removal Assessment

**8/1995 -** Draft Hazard Ranking System (HRS) package was created a site score of [redacted] (Is there a rubric with specific criteria for scoring? Where is [redacted] on that rubric?)

**3/14/1996** - The draft HRS package was not formally reviewed and finalized since the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania no longer supported listing the site on the NPL (Does this mean that DEP decided that Bishop Tube should NOT be a priority for EPA and/or should be their responsibility?)

**11/30/1999 –** Other Cleanup Activity – EPA recognized PADEP as primary regulatory oversight (this is one of my main questions: who decides which agency is primary and how do they determine this?)

**3/17/2005 –** A Consent Order and Agreement went into effect between PADEP and Constitution Drive Partners (Developer). 1st amendment to the order was on 1/22/2007 and 2nd amendment to the order was 6/4/2010

**Currently -** Site is in SEMS as an active OCA with PADEP being the lead agency on the site & cleanup. Part of SAM's workshare sites. PADEP very active on the site and is in the process finding the extent of the plume downgradient. PADEP suggests to keep the site status in SEMS as OCA (Other Cleanup Activity) in case they want to pursue NPL route in the future. (How does this allow DEP to pursue NPL in the future? I also am curious to understand how this site has escaped ALL remediation since 1980. I have seen no evidence that anything has been done by either EPA or DEP to prevent the contaminants from impacting neighbors or the exceptional value water source nearby.

Sasha Brown
Pennsylvania State & Congressional Liaison
U.S EPA Region III
1650 Arch St. (3CR00)
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Brown.Kinshasa@epa.gov
215-814-5404