Message

From: Carpenter, Angela [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C846A1A5E3564A08938A50B1D32D3094-CARPENTER, ANGELA]
Sent: 3/22/2022 1:21:13 PM
To: Ketu, Rupika [Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov]; Sivak, Michael [Sivak.Michael@epa.gov]
CC: Vaughn, Stephanie [Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: RK ARS

Great, thank you!!

From: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 9:07 AM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

Yes, sounds good! And as an FYI, waiting on NJDEP to get back to me about when they're available. Will update with an invite.

From: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 9:02 AM
To: Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>; Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

Go for it!

Michael Sivak
(he, him, his)

sivak.michael@epa.gov | 212.637.4310 (desk) | 646.438.5237 (cell)

From: Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 8:58 AM
To: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>; Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

See below, I think we need to be a bit proactive with this one!

From: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 8:42 AM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

Thank you both! Updated talking points:

- The current, approved scenario remains most protective of human health.

- This scenario was based on the exposure scenario in the baseline human health risk assessment, and was concluded to be the most protective scenario for the passive recreator, looking at 84 days/year and 12 years.
- We recognize that the approved scenario needs to be updated with the latest toxicity values presented in May 2021 ARS Technical Guidance.

- As such, we will direct the PRP group to revise the values using updated toxicity values.
- We would then approve the updated ARS memo and move forward with including these values in the FS.

From: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 8:23 AM
To: Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>; Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

Great clarification!

Michael Sivak
(he, him, his)

sivak.michael@epa.gov | 212.637.4310 (desk) | 646.438.5237 (cell)

From: Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 8:21 AM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

True, it's a fine line but I can't talk either (see below in blue). A small point but I want to be upfront that we aren't looking to reopen the scenario – just update it.

From: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 8:14 AM
To: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

HA! Thorough? Or OCD? It's a fine line.

Michael Sivak
(he, him, his)

sivak.michael@epa.gov | 212.637.4310 (desk) | 646.438.5237 (cell)

From: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 8:13 AM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>

Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

So thorough, thanks Michael ☺

From: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 8:10 AM
To: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

A few edits, below in red.

Michael Sivak
(he, him, his)

sivak.michael@epa.gov | 212.637.4310 (desk) | 646.438.5237 (cell)

From: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 1:04 PM
To: Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>; Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

Yeah, that makes sense to me. It's Jill McKenzie. I think she's been on it for a while now and was around when the scenario was initially approved.

Initial talking points so far (feel free to add):

- Can we continue with the approved scenario; this scenario was based on the exposure scenario in the baseline human health risk assessment, and was concluded to be the most protective scenario for the passive recreator, looking at 84 days/year and 12 years. The talking point should be that we've reviewed the scenario (using Michael's edits) and concluded it remains the most protective, however, we recognize that it needs to be updated with the latest tox values that the state has incorporated into their tech reg. I don't want to appear that we're asking them to reopen the scenario, just the updating of the tox values.
- Update 2018 ARS memo with updated toxicity values; if NJDEP agrees to move forward with the scenario used to develop the 2018 ARS that were approved by NJDEP, we will direct the PRP group to revise the values using updated toxicity values.
- We would then approve the ARS memo and move forward with including these values in the FS.

Let me know if I should go ahead and set up a call.

Thanks,
Rupika

From: Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 12:55 PM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

I tend to agree. We should have a discussion with DEP then decide how to proceed and provide direction to the PRPs.

Rupika, who's the state case manager these days?

From: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 12:45 PM
To: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

I was thinking that we'd reach out to NJDEP first, before we ask the group to update the memo. I think we could develop talking points for a conversation with the state without an updated memo, as long as we could reference the handy table.

At this point, I'd be hesitant to ask the group to spend any effort on something that we don't have a final answer for, but that's just my input.

Michael Sivak

sivak.michael@epa.gov | 212.637.4310 (desk) | 646.438.5237 (cell)

From: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 12:40 PM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

Yes, my understanding is that we will ask John to update the memo, and then discuss with NJDEP…but open to other approaches!

From: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 12:38 PM
To: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>; Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RK ARS

If we decide that L is the way to go (2018 values approved by NJDEP and revised with updated toxicity values), will we be the ones to ask NJDEP if these are acceptable?

Michael Sivak

sivak.michael@epa.gov | 212.637.4310 (desk) | 646.438.5237 (cell)

From: Ketu, Rupika <Ketu.Rupika@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 11:44 AM
To: Carpenter, Angela <Carpenter.Angela@epa.gov>; Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RK ARS

Hi All,

Just to confirm, we're waiting to receive the table that John Persico shared at last week's ARS meeting before directing them how to move forward, right? Column L vs T, etc...

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Rupika Ketu
Remedial Project Manager
Superfund and Emergency Management Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2
ketu.rupika@epa.gov | 212-637-3258