Message

From: Berkoff, Michael [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F347C01A92D7424FA840C24F6B7FBF6B-MBERKOFF]
Sent: 10/26/2016 5:55:46 PM
To: Bassler, Rachel [Bassler.Rachel@epa.gov]; Arcaute, Francisco [Arcaute.Francisco@epa.gov]; Cannon, Phillippa [Cannon.Phillippa@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Allied press Q and A's = comments, please

I think that these are done. Just want to quickly talk to Becky. I will let you know asap.

From: Bassler, Rachel
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 11:26 AM
To: Arcaute, Francisco <Arcaute.Francisco@epa.gov>; Berkoff, Michael <berkoff.michael@epa.gov>; Cannon, Phillippa <Cannon.Phillippa@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Allied press Q and A's = comments, please

Yes, they are still looking for responses. I can send the finals when ready. Thanks!

Rachel Bassler
Press Officer
U.S. EPA Region 5
bassler.rachel@epa.gov
p: 312-886-7159
c: 312-914-3393

From: Arcaute, Francisco
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 10:52 AM
To: Berkoff, Michael <berkoff.michael@epa.gov>; Cannon, Phillippa <Cannon.Phillippa@epa.gov>; Bassler, Rachel <Bassler.Rachel@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Allied press Q and A's = comments, please

Morning – any other comments?

Rachel – do we still want to send to the reporters?

Thanks

F

MLive Question – Why didn't EPA select bioremediation by BioPath Solutions?

> EPA has a stated preference for treatment of contaminated materials when practical. EPA invited BioPath Solutions to present its technology and how it might be demonstrated in a bench-scale study. The BioPath team did not explain how its technology breaks down PCBs nor did it provide a plan for a bench-scale study. Since then, it has provided no information showing its technology could successfully treat the contaminated materials at OU1
>
> EPA evaluated a wide range of treatment technologies in the Feasibility Study (the document by which evaluates potential remedies) and in a separate evaluation by EPA's subject matter experts. Both reviews concluded that, based on the nature of the waste at Allied Landfill, there

are no known treatment technologies that would successfully and practicably treat the waste at OU1 in a cost-effective manner. Both reviews included an evaluation of bioremediation.

Metal Miner question - what exactly does the timeline look like for the design and implementation of the remedy, per today's release? And is EPA using the services of any private/third party firms to complete this cleanup plan?

Following the Record of Decision for Allied Landfill, and the Agency's enforcement efforts, EPA will engage potentially responsible parties in the design and implementation of the remedy. This process may take six months to one year to complete.

EPA projects the design to take one and one half years to complete, and the implementation of the remedy an estimated two years.

From: Berkoff, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 8:12 AM
To: Cannon, Phillippa <Cannon.Phillippa@epa.gov>; Arcaute, Francisco <Arcaute.Francisco@epa.gov>; Bassler, Rachel <Bassler.Rachel@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Allied press Q and A's = comments, please

Making a slight modification in red.

From: Cannon, Phillippa
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 3:54 PM
To: Arcaute, Francisco <Arcaute.Francisco@epa.gov>; Berkoff, Michael <berkoff.michael@epa.gov>; Bassler, Rachel <Bassler.Rachel@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Allied press Q and A's = comments, please

I think the answer to the first question about BioPath is too long. I suggest shortening it to the following:

MLive Question – Why didn't EPA select bioremediation by BioPath Solutions?

EPA has a stated preference for treatment of contaminated materials when practical. EPA invited BioPath Solutions to present its technology and how it might be demonstrated in a bench-scale study. The BioPath team did not explain how its technology breaks down PCBs nor did it provide a plan for a bench-scale study. Since then, it has provided no information showing its technology could successfully treat the contaminated materials at OU1

EPA evaluated a wide range of treatment technologies in the Feasibility Study (the document by which evaluates potential remedies) and in a separate evaluation by EPA's subject matter experts. Both reviews concluded that, based on the nature of the waste at Allied Landfill, there are no known treatment technologies that would successfully and practicably treat the waste at OU1 in a cost-effective manner. Both reviews included an evaluation of bioremediation.

Phillippa Cannon
Chief, Community Involvement Section
U.S. EPA Region 5
312-353-6218

From: Arcaute, Francisco
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 3:37 PM
To: Berkoff, Michael <berkoff.michael@epa.gov>; Bassler, Rachel <Bassler.Rachel@epa.gov>
Cc: Cannon, Phillippa <Cannon.Phillippa@epa.gov>
Subject: Allied press Q and A's = comments, please

Folks

Helping Rachel, who's having internet access issues. Comments, please -

MLive Question – Why didn't EPA select bioremediation by BioPath Solutions?

EPA's Superfund program establishes five principal requirements for the selection of remedies. Remedies must:

- protect human health and the environment;
- comply with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements unless a waiver is justified;
- be cost-effective;
- utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies or resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable;
- satisfy a preference for treatment as a principal element, or provide an explanation in the record of decision as to why this preference was not met.

Based on these criteria, Biopath was not chosen for the Allied site because:

Following the DATE HERE public comment period for the proposed remedy, EPA invited BioPath Solutions to present their technology and how it might be demonstrated in a bench-scale study. In March 2015, BioPath Solutions met with EPA and the City of Kalamazoo at EPA's Chicago office. The BioPath team did not explain the means by which its technology breaks down PCBs nor did it provide a plan for a bench-scale study. Biopath has.

EPA has a stated preference for treatment of contaminated materials when practical. EPA evaluated a wide range of treatment technologies in the Feasibility Study (the document by which evaluates potential remedies) and in a separate evaluation by EPA's subject matter experts. Both reviews concluded that, based on the nature of the waste at Allied Landfill, there are no known treatment technologies that would successfully and practicably treat the waste at OU1 in a cost-effective manner. Both reviews included an evaluation of bioremediation;

Due to the absence of any current information suggesting that effective and cost-effective on-site treatment technologies are potentially available, EPA considered it inappropriate to select any such technologies - including BioPath's - as a viable remedy for Allied Landfill.

Metal Miner question - what exactly does the timeline look like for the design and implementation of the remedy, per today's release? And is EPA using the services of any private/third party firms to complete this cleanup plan?

Following the Record of Decision for Allied Landfill, and the Agency's enforcement efforts, EPA will engage potentially responsible parties in the design and implementation of the remedy. This process may take six months to one year to complete.

EPA projects the design to take one and one half years to complete, and the implementation of the remedy an estimated two years.

Thanks

F