Message

From: Krall, Scott M [SKrall@ppg.com]
Sent: 7/11/2020 11:26:44 AM
To: Smeraldi, Josh [Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov]
CC: Ken Bird [kbird@woodardcurran.com]; Sivak, Michael [Sivak.Michael@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: <EXT>EPA response for FS

Hello Josh

PPG will get back to you if we have any questions

Scott Krall CPG, CHMM
Corporate EHS
PPG Industries, Inc.

PPG – Monroeville Business & Technology Center
440 College Park Drive
Monroeville, PA 15146
T: +1 724-325-5062
M: +1 412-266-1525
E: skrall@ppg.com
www.ppg.com

From: Smeraldi, Josh <Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2020 6:23 PM
To: Krall, Scott M
Cc: Ken Bird; Sivak, Michael
Subject: <EXT>EPA response for FS

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Scott,

We completed our review of the FS however we have not completed our formal response to PPG's letter. In the interest of time, I am forwarding our redline and comments on the FS so that PPG can begin reviewing. The letter will provide more detail and should be sent Monday but, generally, EPA believes that lead is a site-related contaminant and is impacting the groundwater. Due to this determination, the proposed groundwater alternative 5 would not meet groundwater ARARs and is screened out (additional concerns are mentioned in the FS). Table 5-1 and Table 6-1 need to be restored to EPA's June 22 version (attached).

Furthermore, it was brought to our attention that guidance on institutional control states that ICs "shall not substitute for active response measures…as the sole remedy unless such active measures are determined not to be practicable, based on the balancing of trade-offs among alternatives that is conducted during the selection of remedy." https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/documents/final_pime_guidance_december_2012.pdf This affects soil/fill alternative 2. ICs along with a fence is not a permanent or enduring engineering control for contaminated soils and the NAPL removal does not address the soil contamination across the site. In the interest of time, we only changed the comparative analysis to state that soil/fill alternative 2 does not meet ARARs.

Below are a few items that need to be updated:

1. TEXT – Please review edits and comments in the word document
2. FIGURES – There are a few figures that need edits. Please see attached file.
3. COSTS – Some cost estimates needed to be adjusted due to the reduced cap acreage; Attached is the corrected Appendix B and Table 6-2.
4. TABLE 3-1 – Please see attached.
    a. We accepted edits to move the sentence on vapor intrusion from Section 3.1.2 to Section 3.4.2. To be consistent with the text, the title of Table 3-1 was updated (see attachment).
    b. Footnote 2 was deleted and has been restored (see attachment).
5. TABLE 3-6 - Nickel needs to be removed from Table 3-6 (since nickel has no ARAR exceedances). See attachment

Let me know if you have any questions. Please review and let us know your response by Friday 7/17. Also, please raise any concerns as soon as possible because we do not have any time for week long reviews after this point.

Thanks,

Josh

--

Josh Smeraldi, Ph.D. Env. Eng
EPA Region 2 Superfund and Emergency Management Division
212 637 4302

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:
This email (including any attachments) is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient/s and may contain confidential information, which also may be legally privileged. Any reliance upon, access to, review, disclosure, copying, forwarding or other distribution of any or all of the contents in this message by others who are not the intended recipients is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the message and all copies and confirm to the sender by email. Your cooperation is appreciated.