Message

From: Yeh, Alice [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D302128F8E884F9C901E32CE76B609C8-YEH, ALICE]
Sent: 8/5/2021 5:17:20 PM
To: Ana Baptista [baptista@newschool.edu]; doug@forumfg.com
CC: Kandil, Shereen [Kandil.Shereen@epa.gov]; michele [michele@nynjbaykeeper.org]; Salkie, Diane [salkie.diane@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Passaic River: September 9th CAG Meeting

Oh, and if it would be helpful to talk about this, please let me know, I can try to schedule a quick call.

From: Yeh, Alice
Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 1:09 PM
To: Ana Baptista <baptista@newschool.edu>; doug@forumfg.com
Cc: Salkie, Diane <Salkie.Diane@epa.gov>; Kandil, Shereen <Kandil.Shereen@epa.gov>; michele <michele@nynjbaykeeper.org>
Subject: RE: Passaic River: September 9th CAG Meeting

The CAG should feel free to recommend that he speak directly with EPA.

You should know that various Volcano Partners representatives have already met with various EPA representatives, and we have consistently told them what is written in the lower 8.3 mile Record of Decision (ROD): that if any company successfully demonstrates that its technology can decontaminate Lower Passaic River sediments, and is able to site and construct a local decontamination technology facility, EPA could modify the selected remedy for the lower 8.3 miles through a ROD amendment or Explanation of Significant differences to allow for local decontamination and beneficial use of all or part of the sediment. However, it would be inappropriate for EPA to endorse, promote or advocate for any specific technology to be incorporated into the design.

If you would like to refer him to EPA, you may use my contact info or Michael Sivak's as listed below:

Alice Yeh
Remedial Project Manager
212-637-4427
yeh.alice@epa.gov

Michael Sivak
Chief of the Passaic, Hackensack and Newark Bay Remediation Branch
212-637-4310
sivak.michael@epa.gov

From: Ana Baptista <baptista@newschool.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 12:45 PM
To: doug@forumfg.com
Cc: Salkie, Diane <Salkie.Diane@epa.gov>; Yeh, Alice <Yeh.Alice@epa.gov>; Kandil, Shereen <Kandil.Shereen@epa.gov>; michele <michele@nynjbaykeeper.org>
Subject: Re: Passaic River: September 9th CAG Meeting

Thanks Doug for helping us manage the responses to this. I really don't think we should be taking up this issue in the CAG, particularly when we are well past the stage of consideration of these topics. I agree, let's check in with EPA and then figure out a plan on how best to proceed. I'd hate to lose focus on the pieces we

need to be working on as a CAG. Would it be possible to recommend he speak directly with EPA since the CAG is not the right venue to bring this to?

thanks
Ana

On Thu, Aug 5, 2021 at 12:15 PM Doug Sarno <doug@forumfg.com> wrote:

Just FYI, he is doing a full court press on the CAG, I am not sure where he thinks there is still room for this conversation on either stretch of the river but I assume he thinks it all is. I don't think the CAG has any real interest in providing a venue for this continued conversation (I will let Ana and Michelle speak for themselves), but it might be worth a discussion at some point so that EPA and the CAG talk about what is an appropriate response and see if we are on the same page.

thanks,
Doug

Begin forwarded message:

From: <bill.cutler@cement-lock.com>
Subject: Passaic River: September 9th CAG Meeting
Date: August 5, 2021 at 11:17:44 AM EDT
To: "Doug Sarno" <doug@forumfg.com>, "'Ana Baptista'" <baptista@newschool.edu>, "'Al Hendricks '" <al.hendricks@cement-lock.com>

Doug:

I hope you are having a good summer.

As suggested in my July 6th email, we believe you are "*right on target*" that the permanent removal of contaminated materials from the Passaic River is preferred. Not only does the permanent elimination of contaminants from the environment avoid future health risk due to an engineering failure or natural disaster, it eliminates the legacy liabilities to PRPs.

Final Remedy
In terms of the final remedy on the site, the same opposition to onsite treatment and incineration of the materials stored there remains. The permanent removal of contaminated materials on site is preferred. Permanent removal of the materials on the property would allow for long term use of the site without the worry of maintaining institutional controls in perpetuity. Short of permanent removal, continued secure storage of the contaminated products is necessary which greatly limits future use of the site and creates an ongoing threat to human health and the environment.

The manufacturing of a high-grade, non-hazardous cement from contaminated materials has three distinct benefits to the PRPs:

- Their Legacy Liabilities are extinguished,

- The by-product of the Cement Lock process is a cement admixture that surpasses the performance specifications (*at a lower cost*) than Portland cement, and
- The Cement Lock process uses Carbon Capture technologies that reduces Greenhouse Gas production with the potential for sharing carbon credits.

We would like to help you achieve your stated goals. This may be possible with a presentation of the latest technologies that have been introduced into the Cement Lock process. Please provide a 20-minute period at the September CAG meeting that will allow us to share the new economic and environmental benefits of this technology while meeting the Environmental Justice mandates established by the current Administration.

Regards,

Bill Cutler
Volcano Partners, LLC
150 Spartan Dr., Suite 100
Maitland, FL 32751

T – (786) 487-4409

www.cementlock.com

--
Ana Isabel Baptista, PhD
Assistant Professor of Professional Practice,
Environmental Policy & Sustainability Management Program
Associate Director, Tishman Environment & Design Center (TEDC)

Milano School of Policy, Management and Environment
72 5th Avenue, Room 506, New York, NY 10011
Baptista@newschool.edu
T 212 229 5400 x4766
@ProfAnaBaptista