From: Valdez, Heather
To: "Brian.English@deq.idaho.gov"; Weigel, Greg
Subject: RE: Pond 16S
Date: Thursday, July 07, 2016 11:00:00 AM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png

Hi Brian and Greg, Can you tell me if FMC has a reason why they extract from standpipes, pvc material, rather than the metal TMPs. I found a comment about TMP being a better place to extract from for that reason in the notes. Is there anything in writing you know of where FMC makes the case for why they are not using the TPMs as the extraction locations? Forgive me if I have been told this already I just don't remember. Thought I would ask you before I raised the questions to you.

Thanks

Bout to get on call now

Heather Valdez
Chemical Engineer, Project Manager
RCRA Corrective Actions, Permits and PCBs Unit
EPA Region 10
1200 6th Ave, Suite 900, AWT-150, Seattle WA, 98101
(206) 553-6220
valdez.heather@epa.gov

From: Brian.English@deq.idaho.gov [mailto:Brian.English@deq.idaho.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 8:49 AM
To: Valdez, Heather <Valdez.Heather@epa.gov>
Cc: Douglas.Tanner@deq.idaho.gov; Robert.Bullock@deq.idaho.gov
Subject: Pond 16S

I suggest that in addition to adding the unit on the south perimeter pipe you tell FMC to add a second unit to the north perimeter pipe. The extracted volumes are quite low when compared to the volume under the cap and you want the PH3 numbers to go down. At the current extraction rates FMC could operate a second unit for at least a month without causing a GES unit to operate below capacity.