From: Gorin, Jonathan
To: DiPippo, Gary
Cc: John M. Hoffman; Carrie McGowan
Subject: RE: Quick Questions
Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 8:26:24 AM

Gary, you're correct.

I will explain there are a number of issues we considered when choosing treatment over removal: policy (compliance with NCP's preference for treatment rather than removal), short term impacts (transportation/vaporization) and implimentability (a place to send it). The latter being the biggest issue.

I'll wasn't sure if we ever made a determination about trains. I will explain that trains or even using the planned Turnpike spur may be solutions to the tranportation question, but that's uncertain and wouldn't change the fact we'd have no good options on where to send it.

From: DiPippo, Gary <Gary.DiPippo@Cornerstoneeg.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 5:44 PM
To: Gorin, Jonathan
Cc: John M. Hoffman; Carrie McGowan
Subject: RE: Quick Questions

John,

We did not do much of an analysis of rail transport, other than acknowledge it might be a possibility, but would also require reactivating a rail spur at the site. As you may be implying below, this was not an over-riding consideration as the more substantive issue has been the inability to confirm acceptance, along with other issues such as the likely need for an LDR variance if it were in the US.

I hope this helps. If there is anything else I can do, please let me know.

Gary

From: Gorin, Jonathan [mailto:Gorin.Jonathan@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 5:22 PM
To: DiPippo, Gary
Cc: John M. Hoffman; Carrie McGowan
Subject: Quick Questions

Gary, i recall we discussed using trains to remove soil at one time. Do you remember any findings pertaining to that? Not very important, just cover the bases.

Carrie the LCP Bridge Street RPM isn't around right now. Do you know what sort of cap/cover

they ended up using? The stuff i found on line is contradictory. If not, no problem, i can check with him when he gets back.

thanks, jon