Message

From: Donovan, Betsy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1075D24015DB49549A456BC334BD9C25-DONOVAN, BETSY]
Sent: 8/20/2018 4:55:03 PM
To: Kaur, Supinderjit [Kaur.Supinderjit@epa.gov]; Vaughn, Stephanie [Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Rolling Knolls

FS comments from NJ... I just spoke with Jill and she said that she is sending us more on the fence issue. Steve really wants us to either fence off the private property and/or put signs up. I'm not sure where we are with the "unapproved ic" issue below. I know we had a good call with Maurice, but Jill wants to make sure the FS is very clear about this issue, so I asked her to give us specific locations in FS where they have concerns with the language.

From: McKenzie, Jill [mailto:Jill.McKenzie@dep.nj.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 07, 2018 9:52 AM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
Subject: Rolling Knolls

Hi again. Steve B. provided the below comments on the FS prior to leaving for vacation. I'm sending these to you informally and unedited but wanted to get them out to you.

The responses to NJDEP comments 1 through 4 are acceptable to BEERA; however, in general, BEERA/EES-1 cannot approve the submitted revisions because the language in the Revised Draft FS Report leaves the door wide open for the use of unapproved institutional controls other than a deed notice.

The response to USEPA comment 10 appears incorrect or a typo needs to be corrected (non-dioxin-like PCBs or dioxin-like PCBs?).

Response to NJDEP Comment #5: The Conceptual Plan for Alternatives 3 and 4 (Figure 6-2) are not considered definite in terms of the required extent of access control fencing. This issue remains to be resolved by NJDEP upper management.

Note that this review does not address Appendix B of the FS Report. Comments on Appendix B were submitted in a separate transmittal.