

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I	FIGURES
APPENDIX II	TABLES
APPENDIX III	ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX
APPENDIX IV	STATE CONCURRENCE LETTER
APPENDIX V	RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY
APPENDIX VI	COST DETAILS

Appendix I

Figures

FIGURE 1

SITE LOCATION MAP




FIGURE 3

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF SITE (1963)



APPENDIX II

Tables

TABLE A

**Summary of Chemicals of Concern and
Medium-Specific Exposure Point Concentrations**

Scenario Timeframe: Current/Future

Medium: Groundwater

Exposure Medium: Groundwater

Exposure Point	Chemical of Concern	Concentration Detected		Concentration Units	Frequency of Detection	Exposure Point Concentration (EPC)	EPC Units	Statistical Measure
		Min	Max					
Tap Water ¹	Benzene	0.60	1100	µg/L	18/32	330	µg/L	95% UCL-NP
	Xylenes	1.0	520	µg/L	9/32	270	µg/L	95% UCL-NP
	Aniline	9	16	µg/L	2/2	16	µg/L	Max
	2-Aminopyridine	1.0	520	µg/L	12/32	189	µg/L	95% UCL-NP

95% UCL-NP: 95% Upper Confidence Limit for Nonparametric Data

Max: Maximum Detected Concentration

Scenario Timeframe: Future

Medium: Soil

Exposure Medium: Soil

Exposure Point	Chemical of Concern	Concentration Detected		Concentration Units	Frequency of Detection	Exposure Point Concentration (EPC)	EPC Units	Statistical Measure
		Min	Max					
Soil	Benzene	2	13000	µg/Kg	15/55	4440	µg/Kg	95% UCL-NP
	Toluene	1	52000	µg/Kg	25/55	10000	µg/Kg	95% UCL-NP
	Chlorobenzene	2	12000	µg/Kg	20/55	1000	µg/Kg	95% UCL-NP
	Xylenes	2	300000	µg/Kg	24/55	69000	µg/Kg	95% UCL-NP
	2-Aminopyridine	150	99000	µg/Kg	24/55	23400	µg/Kg	95% UCL-NP

95% UCL-NP: 95% Upper Confidence Limit for Nonparametric Data

Summary of Chemicals of Concern and Medium-Specific Exposure Point Concentrations

This table presents the chemicals of concern (COCs) and exposure point concentrations (EPCs) for each of the COCs detected in soil and groundwater (i.e., the concentration that will be used to estimate the exposure and risk from each COC in soil and groundwater). The table includes the range of concentrations detected for each COC, as well as the frequency of detection (i.e., the number of times the chemical was detected in the samples collected at the site), the EPC and how it was derived.

**TABLE B
SELECTION OF EXPOSURE PATHWAYS**

Scenario Timeframe	Medium	Exposure Medium	Exposure Point	Receptor Population	Receptor Age	Exposure Route	On/Off- Site	Type of Analysis	Rationale for Selection or Exclusion Of Exposure Pathway
Current	Groundwater	Groundwater	Tap Water	Residents	Child & Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	Off-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to groundwater by offsite residents.
		Air	Water Vapors at Showerhead	Residents	Child & Adult	Inhalation	Off-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to groundwater by offsite residents.
	Site Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Trespassers	Adoles.	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by trespasser.
	Lagoon 6 Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Trespassers	Adoles.	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by trespasser.
	Beaverdam Brook/ Otter Kill Surface Water	Surface Water	Surface Water	Trespassers	Adoles.	Dermal	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to surface water in Beaverdam Brook and/or Otter Kill by trespassers.
	Southwest Marsh Sediment	Sediment	Sediment	Trespassers	Adoles.	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to sediments in the Southwest Marsh Area by trespassers.
Current/ Future	Northeast Marsh Sediment	Sediment	Sediment	Occasional Visitors/ Hikers	Adoles.	Dermal/ Ingestion	Off-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to sediments in the Northeast Marsh Area by hikers.
	Northeast Marsh Surface Water	Surface Water	Surface Water	Occasional Visitors/ Hikers	Adoles.	Dermal/ Ingestion	Off-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to surface water in the Northeast Marsh Area by hikers.
	Otter Kill Creek Surface Water	Fish	Fish	Recreat. Anglers	Child & Adult	Ingestion	On/ Off-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to fish in Otter Kill Creek by recreational anglers.
Future	Groundwater	Groundwater	Tap Water	Residents	Child & Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to groundwater by future on-site residents.
		Air	Water Vapors at Showerhead	Residents	Child & Adult	Inhalation	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to groundwater by offsite residents.
	Groundwater	Groundwater	Groundwater	Construct. Workers	Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to groundwater by construction workers during ground intrusive activities.
		Ambient Air	Ambient Air	Construct. Workers	Adult	Inhalation	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to ambient air by construction workers during ground intrusion activities.

TABLE B – SELECTION OF EXPOSURE PATHWAYS (Cont.)

Scenario Timeframe	Medium	Exposure Medium	Exposure Point	Receptor Population	Receptor Age	Exposure Route	On/Off Site	Type of Analysis	Rationale for Selection or Exclusion Of Exposure Pathway
Future (Cont.)	Site Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Park Users	Child & Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by park users.
	Lagoon 6 Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Park Users	Child & Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by park users.
	Site Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Residents	Child & Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by residents.
	Lagoon 6 Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Residents	Child & Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by residents.
	Site Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Park Mainten. Workers	Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by park maintenance workers.
	Lagoon 6 Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Surface Soil	Park Mainten. Workers	Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site surface soils by park maintenance workers.
	Site Soils	Soil	Soil	Construct. Workers	Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site soils by construction workers during ground intrusive activities. Potential exposure to ambient air by construction workers during ground intrusive activities.
		Ambient Air	Ambient Air	Construct. Workers	Adult	Inhalation	On-Site	Quant	
	Lagoon 6 Soils	Soil	Soil	Construct. Workers	Adult	Dermal/ Ingestion	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to site soils by construction workers during ground intrusive activities.
		Ambient Air	Ambient Air	Construct. Workers	Adult	Inhalation	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to ambient air by construction workers during ground intrusive activities.
	Southwest Marsh Area Sediment	Sediment	Sediment	Recreat. Users	Child & Adult	Dermal	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to sediment in the Southwest Marsh Area by recreational users.
	Beaverdam Brook Surface Water	Surface Water	Surface Water	Recreat. Users	Child & Adult	Dermal	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to surface water in the Beaverdam Brook by recreational users.
	Otter Kill Surface Water	Surface Water	Surface Water	Recreat. Users	Child & Adult	Dermal	On-Site	Quant	Potential exposure to surface water in the Otter Kill by recreational users.

Quant = Quantitative risk analysis performed.

Summary of Selection of Exposure Pathways

The table describes the exposure pathways associated with the groundwater that were evaluated for the risk assessment, and the rationale for the inclusion of each pathway. Exposure media, exposure points, and characteristics of receptor populations are included.

TABLE C

Non-Cancer Toxicity Data Summary

Pathway: Oral/Dermal

Chemical of Concern	Chronic/ Subchronic	Oral RfD Value	Oral RfD Units	Absorp. Efficiency (Dermal)	Adjusted RfD (Dermal)	Adj. Dermal RfD Units	Primary Target Organ	Combined Uncertainty /Modifying Factors	Sources of RfD: Target Organ	Dates of RfD:
Benzene	Chronic	4.0E-3	mg/kg-day	100%	4.0E-3	mg/kg-day	Blood	300	IRIS	11/10/04
Toluene	Chronic	2.0E-01	mg/kg-day	100%	2.0E-01	mg/kg-day	Liver	1000	IRIS	11/10/04
Xylenes	Chronic	2.0E-01	mg/kg-day	100%	2.0E-01	mg/kg-day	Body Weight	1000	IRIS	11/10/04
Aniline	Chronic	7.0E-03	mg/kg-day	NA	7.0E-03	mg/kg-day	Spleen	3000	R3 RBC	10/08/04
Chlorobenzene	Chronic	2.0E-02	mg/kg-day	100%	2.0E-02	mg/kg-day	Liver	1000	IRIS	11/10/04
2-Aminopyridine	Chronic	2.0E-05	mg/kg-day	100%	2.0E-05	mg/kg-day	Liver	10000	HEAST	07/01/97

Pathway: Inhalation

Chemical of Concern	Chronic/ Subchronic	Inhalation RfC	Inhalation RfC Units	Inhalation RfD	Inhalation RfD Units	Primary Target Organ	Combined Uncertainty /Modifying Factors	Sources of RfD: Target Organ	Dates:
Benzene	Chronic	3.0E-02	mg/m3	8.6E-03	mg/kg-day	Blood	1000	IRIS	11/10/04
Toluene	Chronic	4.0E-01	mg/m3	1.14E-01	mg/kg-day	Liver	300	IRIS	11/10/04
Xylenes	Chronic	1.0E-01	mg/m3	3.0E-02	mg/kg-day	CNS	300	IRIS	11/10/04
Aniline	Chronic	NA	mg/m3	2.86E-04	mg/kg-day	Spleen	NA	R3 RBC	10/08/04
Chlorobenzene	Chronic	6.0E-02	mg/m3	1.7E-02	mg/kg-day	Liver	NA	R3 RBC	10/08/04
2-Aminopyridine	Chronic	NA	mg/m3	NA	mg/kg-day			NA	11/10/04

Key

NA: No information available
 IRIS: Integrated Risk Information System, U.S. EPA
 NCEA: National Center for Environmental Assessment
 HEAST: Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables
 R3 RBC: EPA Region 3 Risk-Based Concentration Table
 CNS: Central Nervous System

Summary of Toxicity Assessment

This table provides non-carcinogenic risk information which is relevant to the contaminants of concern in soil and groundwater. When available, the chronic toxicity data have been used to develop oral reference doses (RfDs) and inhalation reference doses (RfDi).

TABLE D

Cancer Toxicity Data Summary

Pathway: Oral/Dermal

Chemical of Concern	Oral Cancer Slope Factor	Units	Adjusted Cancer Slope Factor (for Dermal)	Slope Factor Units	Weight of Evidence/ Cancer Guideline Description	Source	Date
Benzene	5.5E-02	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	5.5E-02	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	A	IRIS	11/10/04
Toluene	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04
Xylenes	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04
Aniline	5.7E-03	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	5.7E-03	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	B2	IRIS	11/10/04
Chlorobenzene	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04
2-Aminopyridine	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg/day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04

Pathway: Inhalation

Chemical of Concern	Unit Risk	Units	Inhalation Slope Factor	Slope Factor Units	Weight of Evidence/ Cancer Guideline Description	Source	Date
Benzene	7.8E-06	(mg/m ³) ⁻¹	2.7E-02	(mg/kg-day) ⁻¹	A	IRIS	11/10/04
Toluene	NA	(mg/m ³) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg-day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04
Xylenes	NA	(mg/m ³) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg-day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04
Aniline	NA	(mg/m ³) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg-day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04
Chlorobenzene	NA	(mg/m ³) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg-day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04
2-Aminopyridine	NA	(mg/m ³) ⁻¹	NA	(mg/kg-day) ⁻¹	D	IRIS	11/10/04

Key:

IRIS: Integrated Risk Information System. U.S. EPA
 NA: No information available

EPA Weight of Evidence:

- A - Human carcinogen
- B1 - Probable Human Carcinogen-Indicates that limited human data are available
- B2 - Probable Human Carcinogen-Indicates sufficient evidence in animals associated with the site and inadequate or no evidence in humans
- C - Possible human carcinogen
- D - Not classifiable as a human carcinogen
- E- Evidence of noncarcinogenicity

Summary of Toxicity Assessment

This table provides carcinogenic risk information which is relevant to the contaminants of concern in soil and groundwater. Toxicity data are provided for both the oral and inhalation routes of exposure.

TABLE E
Risk Characterization Summary - Noncarcinogens

Scenario Timeframe: Future
Receptor Population: Resident
Receptor Age: Child & Adult

Medium	Exposure Medium	Exposure Point	Chemical of Concern	Primary Target Organ	Non-Carcinogenic Risk			
					Ingestion	Inhalation	Dermal	Exposure Routes Total
Ground-water	Ground-water	Tap Water	Benzene	Blood	5	16	0.8	21
			Xylenes	CNS	0.08	4	0.05	4
			Aniline	Spleen	0.1	23	0.003	23
			2-Aminopyridine	Liver	570	--	6	570
Groundwater Hazard Index Total ¹ =								620
Total Liver HI =								570
Total Spleen HI =								23
Total Blood HI =								21
Total Central Nervous System HI =								4

Scenario Timeframe: Future
Receptor Population: Construction Worker
Receptor Age: Adult

Medium	Exposure Medium	Exposure Point	Chemical of Concern	Primary Target Organ	Non-Carcinogenic Risk			
					Ingestion	Inhalation	Dermal	Exposure Routes Total
Soils	Soils	Soils	Benzene	Blood	0.001	42	--	42
			Toluene	Liver	--	7	--	7
			Chlorobenzene	Liver	--	5	--	5
			Xylenes	Body Weight	--	61	--	61
			2-Aminopyridine	Liver	1.3	--	0.2	2
Soils Hazard Index Total ¹ =								120
Total Liver HI =								14
Total Body Weight HI =								61
Total Blood HI =								42

The HI represents the summed HQs for all chemicals of potential concern at the site, not just those chemicals requiring remedial action which are shown here.

Summary of Risk Characterization - Non-Carcinogens

The table presents hazard quotients (HQs) for each route of exposure and the hazard index (sum of hazard quotients) for all routes of exposure. The Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund states that, generally, a hazard index (HI) greater than 1 indicates the potential for adverse non-cancer effects.

TABLE F

Risk Characterization Summary - Carcinogens

Scenario Timeframe:		Future					
Receptor Population:		Resident					
Receptor Age:		Child & Adult					
Medium	Exposure Medium	Exposure Point	Chemical of Concern	Carcinogenic Risk			
				Ingestion	Inhalation	Dermal	Exposure Routes Total
Groundwater	Groundwater	Tap Water	Benzene	3E-04	7E-04	1E-05	1E-03
Total Risk =							1E-03
Scenario Timeframe:		Future					
Receptor Population:		Construction Worker					
Receptor Age:		Adult					
Medium	Exposure Medium	Exposure Point	Chemical of Concern	Carcinogenic Risk			
				Ingestion	Inhalation	Dermal	Exposure Routes Total
Soils	Soils	Soils	Benzene	4E-09	1E-04	--	1E-04
Total Risk =							1E-04
Summary of Risk Characterization - Carcinogens							
<p>The table presents cancer risks for each route of exposure and for all routes of exposure combined. As stated in the National Contingency Plan, the acceptable risk range for site-related exposure is 10^{-6} to 10^{-4}.</p>							

Table G
ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance
Nepera Chemical Company, Inc Site
Hamptonburgh, New York

Regulatory Level	ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance	Requirement Synopsis
Federal	National Primary Drinking Water Standards (40 CFR Part 141) Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) and Maximum Contaminant Level Goals (MCLGs). Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) [42 U.S.C. § 300f et. Seq.]	Establishes health-based standards for public drinking water systems. Also establishes drinking water quality goals set at levels at which no adverse health effects are anticipated, with an adequate margin of safety.
State	New York Surface Water and Groundwater Quality Standards and Groundwater Effluent Limitations (6NYCRR Part 703)	Establish numerical standards for groundwater and surface water cleanups.
State	New York State Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values and Groundwater Effluent Limitations (Technical and Operational Guidance Series 1.1.1)	Provides ambient water quality guidance values and groundwater effluent limitations for use where there are no standards.
State	New York State Department of Health Drinking Water Standards (10NYCRR Part 5)	Sets maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for public drinking water supplies.

Table G
ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance
Nepera Chemical Company, Inc Site
Hamptonburgh, New York

Regulatory Level	ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance	Requirement Synopsis
State	Environmental Remediation Programs, 6 NYCRR Part 375, Remedial Program Soil Cleanup Objectives, Subpart 375-6, Unrestricted Use Soil Cleanup Objectives, Table 375-6.8(a) and Restricted Use Soil Cleanup Objectives, Table 375-6.8(b)	Establish numerical and procedural standards for soil cleanups.

Regulatory Level	ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance	Requirement Synopsis
Federal	Statement on Procedures on Floodplain Management and Wetlands protection (40 CFR 6 Appendix A)	This Statement of Procedures sets forth Agency policy and guidance for carrying out the provisions of Executive Orders 11988 and 11990.
Federal	Policy on Floodplains and Wetland Assessments for CERCLA Actions (OSWER Directive 9280.0-12, 1985)	Superfund actions must meet the substantive requirements of E.O. 11988, E.O. 11990, and 40 CFR part 6, Appendix A.
Federal	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 USC 4321; 40 CFR 1500 to 1508)	This requirement sets forth EPA policy for carrying out the provisions of the Wetlands Executive Order (EO 11990) and Floodplain Executive Order (EO 11988).
General	National Historic Preservation Act (40 CFR 6.301)	This requirement establishes procedures to provide for preservation of historical and archeological data that might be destroyed through alteration of terrain as a result of a federal construction project or a federally licensed activity or program.
State	Endangered and Threatened Species of Fish and Wildlife (Part 182)	Standards for the protection of threatened and endangered species

ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance	Requirement Synopsis
RCRA Identification and Listing of Hazardous Wastes (40 CFR 261)	Describes methods for identifying hazardous wastes and lists known hazardous wastes.
RCRA Standards Applicable to Generators of Hazardous Wastes (40 CFR 262)	Describes standards applicable to generators of hazardous wastes.
RCRA—Standards for Owners/Operators of Permitted Hazardous Waste Facilities (40 CFR 264.10–164.18)	This regulation lists general facility requirements including general waste analysis, security measures, inspections, and training requirements.
RCRA—Preparedness and Prevention (40 CFR 264.30–264.31)	This regulation outlines the requirements for safety equipment and spill control.
RCRA—Contingency Plan and Emergency Procedures (40 CFR 264.50–264.56)	This regulation outlines the requirements for emergency procedures to be used following explosions, fires, etc.
New York Hazardous Waste Management System – General (6 NYCRR Part 370)	This regulation provides definition of terms and general standards applicable to hazardous wastes management system.
New York Solid Waste Management Regulations (6 NYCRR 360)	Sets standards and criteria for all solid waste management facilities, including design, construction, operation, and closure requirements for the municipal solid waste landfills.
New York Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste (6 NYCRR Part 371)	Describes methods for identifying hazardous wastes and lists known hazardous wastes.
Department of Transportation (DOT) Rules for Transportation of Hazardous Materials (49 CFR Parts 107, 171, 172, 177 to 179)	This regulation outlines procedures for the packaging, labeling, manifesting, and transporting hazardous materials.
RCRA Standards Applicable to Transporters of Hazardous Waste (40 CFR 263)	Establishes standards for hazardous waste transporters.
New York Hazardous Waste Manifest System and Related Standards for Generators, Transporters and Facilities (6 NYCRR Part 372)	Establishes record keeping requirements and standards related to the manifest system for hazardous wastes.
New York Waste Transporter Permit Program (6 NYCRR Part 364)	Establishes permit requirements for transportations of regulated waste.

ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance	Requirement Synopsis
New York Standards for Universal Waste (6 NYCRR Part 374-3) and Land Disposal Restrictions (6 NYCRR Part 376)	These regulations establish standards for treatment and disposal of hazardous wastes.
Safe Drinking Water Act – Underground Injection Control Program (40 CFR 144, 146)	Establish performance standards, well requirements, and permitting requirements for groundwater re-injection wells
New York Regulations on State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) (6 NYCRR parts 750-757)	This permit governs the discharge of any wastes into or adjacent to State waters that may alter the physical, chemical, or biological properties of State waters, except as authorized pursuant to a NPDES or State permit.
New York Surface Water and Groundwater Quality Standards and Groundwater Effluent Limitations (6NYCRR Part 703)	Establish numerical criteria for groundwater treatment before discharge.
New York State Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values and Groundwater Effluent Limitations (TOGS 1.1.1)	Provides groundwater effluent limitations for use where there are no standards.
Clean Air Act (CAA)—National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQs) (40 CFR 50)	These provide air quality standards for particulate matter and volatile organic matter.
Federal Directive – Control of Air Emissions from Superfund Air Strippers (OSWER Directive 9355.0-28)	These provide guidance on the use of controls for superfund site air strippers as well as other vapor extraction techniques in attainment and non-attainment areas for ozone.
New York General Prohibitions (6 NYCRR Part 211)	Prohibition applies to any particulate, fume, gas, mist, odor, smoke, vapor, pollen, toxic or deleterious emissions.
New York Air Quality Standards (6 NYCRR Part 257)	This regulation requires that maximum 24-hour concentrations for particulate matter not be exceeded more than once per year. Fugitive dust emissions from site excavation activities must be maintained below 250 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

ARARs, Criteria, and Guidance	Requirement Synopsis
New York Division of Air Resources DAR-1 (Air Guide-1) AGC/SGC Tables	The tables provide guideline concentrations for toxic ambient air contaminants.

APPENDIX III

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX

NEPERA CHEMICAL CO., INC.
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE
INDEX OF DOCUMENTS*

3.0 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION

3.4 Remedial Investigation Reports

- P. 300001 - Report: Remedial Investigation Report, Maybrook
300600 Lagoon Site, Town of Hamptonburgh, Orange County,
New York, Volume I of IV - Text, Figures and
Tables, prepared by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
(CRA) on behalf of the Maybrook and Harriman
Environmental Trust, June 2006.
- P. 300601 - Report: Remedial Investigation Report, Maybrook
301339 Lagoon Site, Town of Hamptonburgh, Orange County,
New York, Volume II of IV - Appendices A to K,
prepared by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA)
on behalf of the Maybrook and Harriman
Environmental Trust, June 2006.
- P. 301340 - Report: Remedial Investigation Report, Maybrook
302907 Lagoon Site, Town of Hamptonburgh, Orange County,
New York, Volume III of IV - Appendix L, prepared
by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA) on behalf
of the Maybrook and Harriman Environmental Trust,
June 2006.

* Data are summarized in several of these documents. The actual data, QA/QC, chain of custody, etc. are compiled at various EPA offices and can be made available at the record repository upon request. Bibliographies in the documents and in the references cited in the Record of Decision are incorporated by reference in the Administrative Record. Many of these documents referenced in the bibliographies are publicly available and readily accessible. Most of the guidance documents referenced in the bibliographies are available on the EPA website (www.epa.gov). If copies of the documents cannot be located, contact the EPA Project Manager (Mark Dannenberg at (212) 637-4251). Copies of the administrative record documents that are not available in the administrative record repository at the Hamptonburgh Town Hall can be made available at that location upon request.

- P. 302908 - Report: Remedial Investigation Report, Maybrook
303784 Lagoon Site, Town of Hamptonburgh, Orange County,
New York, Volume IV of IV - Appendices M to T,
prepared by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA)
on behalf of the Maybrook and Harriman
Environmental Trust, June 2006.

4.0 FEASIBILITY STUDY

4.3 Feasibility Study Reports

- P. 400001 - Report: Feasibility Study Report, Maybrook Lagoon
400362 Site, Town of Hamptonburgh, Orange County, New York,
prepared by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA) on behalf
of the Maybrook and Harriman Environmental Trust, June
2007.

3.0 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION

3.1 Sampling and Analysis Plans

- P. 303785 - Report: Quality Assurance Project Plan, Additional
303840 Investigation, Former Lagoon Site, Hamptonburgh, New York,
prepared by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA) on behalf
of the Maybrook and Harriman Environmental Trust, March
2001.
- P. 303841 - Report: Additional Soil Sampling Work Plan,
303977 Maybrook Lagoon Site, Hamptonburgh, New York, prepared by
Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA) on behalf of the
Maybrook and Harriman Environmental Trust, March 2003.

3.2 Sampling and Analysis Data/Chain of Custody Forms

- P. 303978 - Report: Sampling Report and Data Presentation,
304614 Nepera Chemical, Hamptonburgh, New York, Sampling of the
Sediment in Beaverdam Brook, prepared by Mr. Michael A.
Mercado, Environmental Scientist, Hazardous Waste Support
Branch (DESA/HWSB), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

May 12-16, 2003.

4.0 FEASIBILITY STUDY

4.6 Correspondence

- P. 400363 - Letter to Mr. George H. Hollerbach, Jr., P.E.,
400366 Project Manager, Quantum Management Group Inc., c/o Pfizer
Inc., from Mr. Mark Dannenberg, Remedial Project Manager,
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2, re:
Feasibility Study Report, Nepera (Maybrook) Site, Town of
Hamptonburgh, New York, May 4, 2007.
- P. 400367 - Letter to Mr. Mark Dannenberg, Remedial Project
400378 Manager, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2,
from Mr. Randy Moore, P.Eng., Conestoga-Rovers &
Associates, re: Final Feasibility Study Transmittal,
Comments on Feasibility Study Cover Letter - May 4, 2007,
Former Lagoon Site (Site) - Town of Hamptonburgh, New York,
June 26, 2007.

7.0 ENFORCEMENT

7.4 Consent Decrees

- P. 700001 - Stipulation Agreement between the New York State
700023 Department of Environmental Conservation and the
Respondents (Nepera, Inc., Warner-Lambert Company, Estate
of William S. Lasdon), March 21, 1988.
- P. 700024 - Consent Decree Between State of New York and
700130 Estate of William S. Lasdon, Nepera, Inc., and Warner-
Lambert Company and Order of Dismissal, (Attachments:
Escrow Agreement, the Private Party Settlement Agreement,
and the Stipulation of Dismissal with Prejudice), May 1,
1998.

7.6 Documentation of Technical Discussions with PRP's

- P. 700131 - Letter to Mr. Maurice Leduc, Director, Regulatory
700135 Affairs, Nepera, Inc., from Mr. John E. LaPadula,
P.E., Chief, New York Remediation Branch, U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency, re: Concerns
Related to the Nepera Chemical Site, July 1, 1998.

8.0 HEALTH ASSESSMENTS

8.1 ATSDR Health Assessments

- P. 800001 - Report: Preliminary Health Assessment, Nepera
800008 Chemical Inc., Maybrook, New York, prepared by New York
State Department of Health Under Cooperative Agreement with
the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, June
30, 1989.
- P. 800009 - Report: Site Review and Update, Nepera Chemical
800019 Company, Inc., Maybrook, Orange County, New York,
prepared by New York State Department of Health Under a
Cooperative Agreement with U.S. Department of Health &
Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic
Substances and Disease Registry, revised January 5, 1994.

10.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

10.9 Proposed Plan

- P. 10.00001- Report: Superfund Proposed Plan, Nepera Chemical
10.00016 Company, Inc. Superfund Site, Hamptonburgh, Orange County,
New York, prepared by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
July 2007.
- P. 10.00017- Letter to Mr. George Pavlou, P.E., Director,
10.00017 Emergency Remedial Response Division, U.S. EPA, Region 2,
from Mr. Dale A. Desnoyers, Director, Division of
Environmental Remediation, New York State Department of
Environmental Conservation, re: Proposed Remedial Action
Plan, Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. Superfund NYSDEC Site
No. 130073, Hamptonburgh, Orange County, July 2007.

APPENDIX IV

STATE CONCURRENCE LETTER


New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

Division of Environmental Remediation, 12th Floor

625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7011

Phone: (518) 402-9706 • FAX: (518) 402-9020

Website: www.dec.ny.gov



Alexander B. Grannis
Commissioner

September 28, 2007

Mr. George Pavlou
Director, Emergency & Remedial Response Division
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Floor 19
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866

Re: Nepera Maybrook, NYSDEC Site No. 336010
Federal Superfund Identification Number: NY000511451
Record of Decision

Dear Mr. Pavlou:


The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the New York State Department of Health have reviewed the above referenced Record of Decision (ROD). The State concurs with the selected remedy as stated in the September 2007 ROD , and as summarized below

- The soil remedy will consist of the excavation of the soil from the six former wastewater lagoons and the treatment of the contaminated soil with soil vapor extraction (SVE) and biological degradation within an engineered below-grade biocell. If necessary, the air removed from the biocell via the SVE will be treated using carbon adsorption prior to being recirculated or exhausted to the atmosphere. It is expected that this remedy will achieve TAGM 4046 and Part 375 soil cleanup objectives as stated in the ROD.
- The groundwater remedy will remediate site groundwater conditions through enhanced in-situ bioremediation of the groundwater contaminants by the indigenous microbial population. The excavated lagoon areas will be treated with oxygenating compounds to create an aerobic environment and stimulate biodegradation of groundwater within the areas of elevated contamination.
- The application of the oxygenating compounds will be followed by a long-term groundwater monitoring program to evaluate the rates of biodegradation and contaminant attenuation and will ensure that this remedy is protective of human health and the environment. It is expected that the groundwater remedy will achieve New York State groundwater standards.
- To enhance aerobic biodegradation outside of the source area, the remedial design will consider location-specific injections of oxygenating compounds at various locations in the groundwater contamination plumes.

- The private supply wells in the vicinity of the site, currently being monitored for site related contaminants, will continue to be sampled periodically as deemed necessary by the NYSDOH.
- The remedy will include institutional controls in the form of an environmental easement/restrictive covenant to be filed in the property records of Orange County to restrict any excavation below the soil surface layer in those areas undergoing remediation, restrict new construction at the site, restrict the use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water, and require that the owner/operator complete and submit periodic certifications that the institutional and engineering controls are in place.
- A Site Management Plan (SMP) will be developed to provide for the proper management of all post-construction site-remedy components, including institutional controls and engineering controls (such as the perimeter fence), identification of site use restrictions, enforcement of the requirements of the easement/covenant, operation and maintenance of the remedy components, and implementation the groundwater monitoring program.
- The institutional controls will continue to apply to the site and the SMP will continue to be implemented until such time as both the site soil cleanup objectives and the groundwater standards are met and discontinuation of the ICs and the SMP is approved by all agencies involved with this project.

If you have any questions, please contact Robert Cozzy at 518-402-9767.

Sincerely,



Dale A. Desnoyers
 Director
 Division of Environmental Remediation

c: M. MacCabe
 M. Dannenberg, USEPA

cc: S. Ervolina
 R. Cozzy
 J. Aversa
 R. Schick
 R. Pergadia, Region 3
 A. Perretta, NYSDOH
 M. Rivara, NYSDOH
 S. Bates, NYSDOH
 G. Litwin, NYSDOH
 J. LaPadula, USEPA
 A. Carpenter, USEPA

APPENDIX V

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Nepera Chemical Company, Inc, Superfund Site

INTRODUCTION

A responsiveness summary is required by regulations promulgated under the Superfund statute. It provides a summary of citizens' comments and concerns received during the public comment period, as well as the responses of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) to those comments and concerns. All comments summarized in this document have been considered in EPA and NYSDEC's final decision involving selection of a remedy for the Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. Superfund Site (Site).

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES

As lead agency for the Site, EPA has ensured that Site reports have been made available for public review at information repositories at the USEPA Region II Superfund Records Center, 290 Broadway, New York, NY, and the Hamptonburgh Town Hall, 18 Bull Road, Campbell Hall, New York.

The Proposed Remedial Action Plan (or Proposed Plan) was prepared by EPA, with consultation by NYSDEC, and finalized on July 31, 2007. A notice of the Proposed Plan and public comment period was published in the Times Herald-Record on July 31, 2007 consistent with the requirements of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) §300.430(f)(3)(i)(A), and a summary of the Proposed Plan was mailed to all persons on the Site mailing list. On July 31, 2007, the EPA released for public comment the Proposed Plan for the Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. Superfund Site (Site). The Proposed Plan was made available for review at the information repositories for the Site. The public comment period began July 31 and ended on August 29, 2007. During the public comment period, EPA held a public meeting on August 16, 2007 to discuss the Proposed Plan and received comments on it. In addition, EPA received written comments on the Proposed Plan during the public comment period. This document summarizes the comments submitted by the public and EPA's responses.

The comments are grouped into the following categories:

- General questions and comments raised by the public (local residents)
 - Past site history
 - Characterization of contamination
 - Remedy Selection and implementation
 - General Issues
- Comments submitted by the Potentially Responsible Parties

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND EPA'S RESPONSES

General questions and comments raised by the public (local residents)

Past Site History

Comment 1: Regarding Nepera's plant in Harriman, NY, has anyone done anything regarding environmental issues at this Site?

Response 1: NYSDEC issued a Record of Decision for the Harriman Site in 1997. The Harriman plant stopped all operations in May 2005. Since that time, the owner of the facility has performed a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation and submitted a report to NYSDEC. NYSDEC reviewed the report and, on July 10, 2007, requested that additional information be included in the report and that a Phase II RCRA Facility Investigation be conducted to fully delineate the extent of the mercury contamination at this location. Questions related to the Nepera-Harriman Site may be addressed to Mr. Paul Patel at NYSDEC. He can be reached at (518)402-8602.

Comment 2: How was the wastewater brought to the lagoons?

Response 2: The wastewater was trucked to the Site from the Nepera plant in Harriman, NY from 1953 through 1967.

Comment 3: Wasn't more than one leak detected in the former lagoons?

Response 3: Yes. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, NY State inspectors detected multiple leaks from the lagoons.

Comment 4: On May 11, 1967, New York State found Nepera was operating curtain drains taking surface water out of their lagoons and disposing of it in surrounding areas.

Response 4: Yes, the curtain drain is discussed in the Remedial Investigation (RI) Report (which is in the Administrative Record). A curtain drain is a perforated trench or conduit that intercepts surface or ground water and diverts it elsewhere. As stated in the RI Report, on May 11, 1967, a contractor to Nepera, Inc. was observed in the process of installing a curtain drain in the vicinity of a previously identified wastewater breakout north of the lagoons. As part of the initial evaluation of this Site, NYSDEC requested that Nepera, Inc. perform an investigation of the curtain drain. This investigation was performed on June 29, 1995. Several test pits were excavated to determine the alignment and extent of the curtain drain. In addition, soil samples were collected from the test pits. Analytical results from the investigation showed little evidence of contamination; the concentration of inorganic contaminants (metals) are similar to background concentrations. Only low concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs) were detected. None of the Site-related pyridine compounds were detected in any of the samples from the test pits.

Comment 5: A resident indicated he observed the Site for years and saw individuals in white suits at the Site at 2 o'clock in the morning.

Response 5: Sampling crews have gone onto this Site in white tyvek suits during the daytime. Since the onset of the RI, EPA is not aware of anyone going onto the Site during the night.

Characterization of Contamination

Comment 6: How sure are you that the assessment of the contaminants has been fully investigated?

Response 6: As part of the RI, hundreds of soil and groundwater samples have been taken at the Site. The analytical data from these samples have been evaluated to determine what contaminants are present, and the areal extent of contamination. These sampling activities and analyses were conducted in an iterative fashion whereby the data from one sampling phase were utilized to determine the sampling and analytical requirements for the next phase. Based on a review of the volume of data obtained during the RI, EPA and NYSDEC determined that the investigation had sufficiently characterized the nature and extent of contamination to select a remedy to address this contamination.

Comment 7: Has the range of possible contaminants investigated by EPA or NYSDEC confirmed the range of contaminants that resulted in the property's designation as a Superfund Site?

Response 7: Yes. The data from the initial investigations have been confirmed by data collected during the RI.

Comment 8: One resident claimed the chemicals from the Site are in his private water well and as a result, is not used for drinking water.

Response 8: Nepera, Inc. and the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) have been collecting samples from private wells for several years. Analytical data from the samples taken from your well indicate that contaminants associated with the Site have never been detected in your private well.

Comment 9: When was the last groundwater testing of private wells done?

Response 9: The last round of groundwater testing was performed in June 2007.

Comment 10: How far away from the Site are the private wells that you are monitoring for Site-related contaminants?

Response 10: The private wells that are being sampled are approximately 175 feet and 200 feet from the northern property boundary and 250 feet from the west-southwest property boundary.

Comment 11: This area where the Site is located sits on some of the largest water reserves in the county. Has the groundwater contamination been detected in the overburden or is it farther down?

Response 11: Contamination has been detected in the overburden aquifer and the underlying bedrock aquifer. Groundwater contamination above health-based standards has largely remained within the Site-property boundary. An ongoing groundwater monitoring program will continue to be performed to evaluate the effectiveness of the selected remedy and to ensure that no private wells are impacted by Site-related contaminants.

Comment 12: Where have the 255 million gallons of highly toxic wastewater which were disposed of in the former lagoons gone?

Response 12: The lagoons were lined and were meant to function as evaporation lagoons. As such, much of the estimated 255 million gallons of waste liquids disposed of in the lagoons likely would have evaporated while the lagoons were still in operation. Some of the wastewater likely seeped through the soil into the aquifer.

Comment 13: What area of soil contamination has occurred?

Response 13: The soil contamination is predominantly restricted to the original area of the constructed lagoons, which is less than 5 acres.

Comment 14: What effect has this Site had over the years on wildlife?

Response 14: No specific study was performed to determine what wildlife were impacted over the years. However, an Ecological Risk Assessment was conducted based on current Site conditions and concluded that contaminants are found in groundwater and soils, but are not present at levels posing significant risks to ecological receptors. As discussed in EPA's Proposed Plan, the potential for risk to ecological receptors exposed to Site-related contaminants was limited to isolated locations, primarily in lagoon 6, and the risk associated with this area used the conservative assumption that the ecological receptors (animals) spend 100% of their lives in this very limited area of Lagoon 6. The contaminants outside of Lagoon 6 were determined not to pose a potential for adverse ecological effects because they were common elements of soil that were not related to Site operations. The detected concentrations were comparable to background levels and the frequency of detections was low. Therefore, no adverse impacts to wildlife are expected.

Comment 15: Has there been a survey of the tributaries in the vicinity of the Site?

Response 15: Yes. Surface water was sampled in 1991 and 1995. Samples were collected from Beaverdam Brook from locations upstream, adjacent to, and downstream of the Site. Furthermore, surface water was also collected from Otter Kill which is downstream of the Site and into which Beaverdam Brook flows. In general, the surface water quality data indicate that the Site has no measurable impact on contaminant concentrations in Otter Kill and Beaverdam Brook. Comparable concentrations of organics and inorganics were reported at both upstream and downstream sampling locations. Sediment samples were also collected from Beaverdam Brook (upstream, adjacent to, and downstream from the Site) in 1991, 1995, and 2003. Numerous semi-volatile organic compounds (primarily polyaromatic

hydrocarbons, which are not considered Site-related) and several pesticides (also, not considered Site-related) were detected at levels exceeding criteria values.

Comment 16: There was significant flooding in May of 2007. Is there any concern about the surface water runoff from the Site?

Response 16: Soil sampling activities have indicated that the surface soil is not contaminated. The contamination is found at depth, in the subsurface soil.

Remedy Selection and Implementation

Comment 17: Is there a program that will test my well system for the contaminants known to exist at the Site?

Response 17: There is an ongoing program performed by the potentially responsible parties (PRPs), under the direction of the NYSDOH, to monitor private wells in the immediate vicinity of the Site. A review of the monitoring program will be conducted during the Remedial Design.

Comment 18: Under the proposed soil remedy (Alternative S4), you can't guarantee the air quality.

Response 18: A community health and safety plan will be prepared to ensure that the construction activities do not cause the spread of contamination. Precautions will be taken to prevent contaminants from becoming airborne. These precautions may include wetting down the soil, putting up curtains to prevent contaminants from spreading, and use of air monitoring devices at the perimeters of the work site to ensure that contaminants are not leaving the work area.

Comment 19: The groundwater remedy Alternative GW3 would guarantee the integrity of the aquifers, but the alternative proposed by EPA (Alternative GW2) would not. It would not guarantee that the contaminants in the future would not move off-Site.

Response 19: While there are no absolute guarantees with respect to any remedy, all of the remedial alternatives for groundwater were assessed for their ability to restore the groundwater to drinking water quality. Groundwater Alternative GW-3 involves a groundwater pump-and-treat system which would contain the migration of contamination in the groundwater within the Site property but the Agency believed this alternative did not provide the best balance of tradeoffs among all the alternatives with respect to the evaluation criteria. The effectiveness of the selected remedy will be assessed in Five-Year reviews (the first review will be due five years after the initiation of construction of the remedy) to ensure that the remedy is protective of human health and the environment and aquifer restoration is occurring.

Comment 20: Even though the soil remedy referred to as Alternative S6, which involves excavating all contaminated soils and removing them for disposal elsewhere, is the most expensive, it guarantees that the Site is a hundred percent clean.

Response 20: The Superfund Act requires EPA to consider nine criteria including cost when selecting a remedy. EPA did not select Alternative S6, which was the most costly alternative to address contaminated soils, because the Agency believed this alternative did not provide the best balance of tradeoffs among all the alternatives with respect to the evaluation criteria.

Comment 21: Who will monitor the Site? Where will the samples be shipped? Who will handle the samples? Who will prepare the monitoring reports?

Response 21: It is anticipated that the PRPs will be responsible for monitoring, under EPA's direction and oversight, pursuant to either a judicial Consent Decree or an EPA administrative order to implement the selected remedy. A comprehensive monitoring plan (which will include soil and groundwater monitoring) will be developed during the Remedial Design. The PRPs will hire a contractor to perform the monitoring. The samples collected will be properly packaged (e.g., put onto ice in a cooler) and shipped off to a certified laboratory for analysis. Chain-of-Custody will be maintained for each sample, from the time the sample is collected through analysis of the sample by the laboratory. EPA will review and approve the sampling and analytical protocol. In addition, EPA will take split-samples (duplicate samples) to verify the analytical data. Reports which will include monitoring data will be compiled by the PRPs and submitted to EPA and will be available for public review.

Comment 22: A resident recommended installing a 360 cap over the area, grading the area to promote runoff, and operating a groundwater pump and treat system.

Response 22: These measures were evaluated in the Feasibility Study and the Proposed Plan. EPA did not select the capping alternative because under this alternative, the contaminated soils would remain on-Site untreated and the Superfund statute has a preference for treatment. The pump-and-treat system was not selected as explained in the response to Comment 19.

Comment 23: A concern was expressed regarding the high volume of traffic that would be created if the remedy called for excavation of contaminated soils with off-Site disposal.

Response 23: EPA did not select this alternative.

Comment 24: What assurances are there that whatever treatment alternative is selected, the water on my property will be okay?

Response 24: Groundwater samples will continue to be collected at monitoring wells on the Site and from private wells in the immediate vicinity of the Site to ensure that no private wells are impacted by Site-related contaminants.

Comment 25: In order to protect the health of the community, Site contamination should be removed.

Response 25: The groundwater will be treated with oxygenating compounds (e.g., oxygen-releasing compounds) to facilitate bioremediation. The soil contamination will be treated to levels that are protective of human health and the environment. EPA did not select the alternative which included excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soils as explained in the response to Comment 20.

Comment 26: How far down are you planning to excavate the soil?

Response 26: Under the proposed soil remedy, all of the contaminated soil in the lagoon area will be excavated down to the bedrock, which is located about 14 feet below the ground surface.

Comment 27: Is there any guarantee that the municipal wells owned by the Village of Maybrook or private wells in the Town of Hamptonburgh will not be affected by contamination at the Site?

Response 27: The Village of Maybrook has public supply wells located near the Site. These wells are analyzed on a quarterly basis for Site-related contaminants, none of which have ever been detected. In the event that monitoring should indicate that the Village of Maybrook public water supply wells have been impacted by the Site-related contaminants above health-based levels, a contingency plan would be necessary to provide for a wellhead treatment for the Village of Maybrook wells on an interim basis pending further consideration of groundwater treatment alternatives to meet groundwater treatment standards. In addition, a groundwater monitoring program will continue to be performed to evaluate the effectiveness of the selected remedy and to ensure that no private wells are impacted by Site-related contaminants. Also see response to Comment 24, above.

Comment 28: What effects will the cleanup have on the deeply imbedded toxic soils?

Response 28: The proposed remedy involves the excavation of all the soil in the area of the former lagoons down to bedrock. As such, any "deeply imbedded" soils will be excavated and treated.

Comment 29: One resident was concerned with how the remediation will affect the aquifer in the long term.

Response 29: The objective of the remediation is to restore the aquifer to drinking water quality. The contamination has existed at this Site for several decades. Both the overburden and bedrock aquifers have been impacted. Implementation of the soil remedy will remove the source of ongoing groundwater contamination. Implementation of the groundwater remedy will further reduce the levels of contaminants in both aquifers.

Comment 30: If Nepera is producing the groundwater monitoring reports, how can you be sure that the reports do not hide the most contentious information?

Response 30: Concealing or falsifying data would be a criminal act. Groundwater monitoring has been conducted with EPA and/or New York State

oversight in accordance with standard chain-of-custody procedures, beginning with the collection of samples and carrying through to receipt and analysis by the laboratory. In addition, EPA reserves the right to analyze split samples for a certain percentage of the environmental samples taken by the PRPs for independent verification of the PRPs' sampling and analytical programs.

Comment 31: If the remedy involves excavating contaminated soil, what is the likelihood that the contaminants will become airborne? My house is located about 500 feet from the Site.

Response 31: Implementation of the remedy would involve using certain protocols to ensure that contaminants would not spread. The protocols may involve wetting-down the soils and/or installing curtains around the excavation area. Also, air monitoring would be performed at the perimeter to ensure contaminants do not migrate beyond the property.

Comment 32: For how long will monitoring be performed after the remedies are implemented?

Response 32: Monitoring (of air, groundwater, and soil) would be performed as appropriate throughout the remedy implementation process. Soil sampling would be performed periodically until cleanup objectives are achieved. Once soil cleanup objectives are achieved no further sampling would be required. Groundwater monitoring would be performed until the aquifers were returned to drinking water quality. Several rounds of groundwater sampling would be conducted over a period of time (e.g., one year) to ensure that drinking water standards continue to be met.

Comment 33: What if the remedy doesn't work?

Response 33: The soil and groundwater remedies are expected to be effective in addressing Site contamination. If they are not, other remedial alternatives would be evaluated.

Comment 34: Are the Site-related chemical contaminants biodegradable?

Response 34: Yes, the Site-related contaminants are, under suitable conditions, biodegradable. EPA personnel performed an extensive literature search to assess the potential effectiveness of the use of oxygenating compounds for bioremediation of compounds found in groundwater at the Site, especially the BTEX compounds (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes). This literature search included reviewing federal documents (including EPA, DOD, and Federal Remedial Technologies Roundtable literature), scientific studies, case studies, and proprietary information dealing with the topic of the use of oxygenating compounds on sites with groundwater contaminated with BTEX compounds.

Often, groundwater contamination is difficult to address because of the heterogeneity of the subsurface, often due to diverse types of materials (e.g., sand, silt, rocks, gravel, etc.) as well as fractures and fissures through which groundwater flows. This heterogeneity can impact how groundwater flows through a contaminated site as well as how the contaminants themselves are dispersed. Furthermore, more traditional

methods of treating groundwater (e.g., pump-and-treat technologies) are often very costly because of long cleanup times associated with these operations, and inefficiencies in removing the contaminants from the subsurface. As such, many alternative technologies have been considered and employed in recent years to remediate sites contaminated with organic contaminants, including BTEX. These alternative technologies include a variety of chemical, biological, and physical processes.

In Situ bioremediation relies on microorganisms living in the subsurface to biologically degrade groundwater contaminants. This is called biodegradation. Biodegradation of organic compounds occurs under aerobic and anaerobic conditions. The majority of bioremediation systems are designed to treat contaminants aerobically. Aerobic processes use oxidation to degrade organic compounds to less toxic compounds such as carbon dioxide and water. A typical aerobic bioremediation system involves stimulating native microorganisms by adding nutrients and oxygen. The use of oxygenating compounds has been used extensively to stimulate bioremediation in contaminated groundwater (and soil) at many sites. Oxygenating compounds (such as Oxygen Releasing Compound® or "ORC®") have been used at thousands of contaminated sites, including many sites impacted with petroleum-based fuels and fuel constituents including the BTEX chemicals. The purpose of using an oxygenating compound such as ORC® is to supply a controlled release of oxygen to accelerate the degradation of contaminants in contaminated groundwater or soil. This is accomplished by creating aerobic conditions in the contaminated media, enabling the naturally occurring bacteria/microorganisms to proliferate and consume the contamination. The microorganisms use the contaminants as a source of food.

A large advantage of bioremediation is that it is a remedy where the contaminated groundwater can be treated in place, using naturally occurring microorganisms, without the need to bring the contaminated groundwater to the surface. Bioremediation technologies have been employed to remediate organic contaminants in groundwater (as well as soil) at numerous Superfund sites. The use of oxygenating compounds has been used to stimulate aerobic biodegradation at a number of other cleanup sites, including sites contaminated by spilled fuel and leaking Underground Storage Tanks.

Based on this review, EPA determined that bioremediation should be an effective alternative treatment technology to treat numerous organic compounds, including BTEX, present in the groundwater at the Site. Pyridine biodegrades naturally in water or soil. EPA determined that bioremediation was appropriate and would likely stimulate subsequent biodegradation of BTEX compounds and reduce the period of time which will be necessary for groundwater standards to be attained.

A partial list of the references used in this review is included below.

References:

1. Use of Bioremediation at Superfund Sites, U.S.EPA, Solid Waste and Emergency Response, EPA 542-R-01-019, September 2001, clu-in.org;
2. Abstracts of Remediation Case Studies, Volume 5, Federal Remediation Technologies Roundtable, Prepared by the Member Agencies of the Federal Remediation Technologies Roundtable, EPA 542-R-01-008, May 2001;

3. Brookhaven National Laboratory Five year Review Report, Brookhaven National Laboratory-Operable Unit IV Superfund Site, Prepared by Environmental Restoration Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York, August 29, 2003;
4. Massachussets Institute of Technology Lecture Series, <http://ocw.mit.edu/NR/rdonlyres/Civil-and-Environmental-Engineering/>;
5. Environmental Protection, Pollution and Waste Treatment Solutions For Environmental Professionals, June 2007 Issue, pgs. 36 - 39, www.epoline.com;
6. Groundwater Contamination - DOD Uses and Develops a Range of Remediation Technologies to Clean Up Military Sites, U.S. Government Accountability Office, Report to Congress, GAO-55-666, June 2005;
7. In Situ Bioremediation of Petroleum Aromatic Hydrocarbons, by J. Steven Brauner & Marc Killingstad, Groundwater Pollution Primer, CE4594: Soil and Groundwater Pollution, Civil Engineering Dept., Virginia Tech, Fall of 1996;
8. ORC Technical Bulletins, Regensis Corp., <http://www.regensis.com/>.

General Issues

Comment 35: Was there any responsibility by the sellers or the realty company to inform me of the proximity of the residence to the Superfund Site when I purchased the house a year ago?

Response 35: There are no federal disclosure laws pertaining to the sale of residential property. New York State, however, does have a property disclosure law. This law requires that the seller disclose conditions concerning conditions regarding the residential real property itself.

Comment 36: My concern is that even after you address the contamination, how am I going to be able to sell my property?

Response 36: EPA's authority pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA" or commonly referred to as "Superfund") does not extend to private claims for personal injury or property damage. EPA cannot give legal advice with respect to private claims which can only be addressed with private legal counsel.

Comment 37: On what census was the population of 6,500 based?

Response 37: The Proposed Plan noted that approximately 7,000 people live within three miles of the Site. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's Census 2000 Summary, there were 4,686 people and 1,532 households residing in the Town of Hamptonburgh. Furthermore, according to the Census 2000 Summary, there were 3,084 people and 1,077 households residing in the Village of Maybrook. This information is posted on the U.S. Census Bureau's website at <http://www.census.gov/census2000/states/ny.html>.

Comment 38: What are the long-term plans for this property?

Response 38: EPA does not determine land-use or zoning requirements for Site properties, that is a local governmental function. The property is currently zoned as residential/agricultural. As a result, EPA determined

that a residential use was a reasonably anticipated future use for the Site property. The cleanup objectives were developed on the basis of a residential use of the property, which typically results in the most stringent cleanup levels. If there were no restriction on usage, the property owner, Nepera, Inc., ultimately would determine the long-term property usage consistent with local land-use and zoning requirements.

Comments Submitted by the Potentially Responsible Parties

Comment 39: As stated in the PRAP (the Proposed Plan), PRGs (Preliminary Remediation Goals) are developed from the list of Chemicals of Concern (COC) identified in the RI. Section 10.2 of the final RI provides a list of soil clean-up objectives and groundwater cleanup levels and states:

"...Final remedial goals for the Site will be based on the remedy selected and the future land use of the Site. Following the approval of the Site-related COC and their PRGs by the USEPA and NYSDEC, the PRGs will then be used to evaluate each remedial alternative during the FS. The retained organic COC and their respective PRGs will then be used in the development of the Preliminary Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) and the Record of Decision (ROD)..."

The RI discussed applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) to be used which resulted in soil cleanup objectives that are protective of ground water based on NYSDEC TAGM #4046 and other NYSDEC evaluations. This is the basis for the evaluation in the FS. However, in the PRAP, the USEPA departed from this previously approved basis as developed under the RIFS and used criteria based on NYS Brownfields regulations. Under the Brownfields criteria, soil standards vary from those used in the FS and an additional cleanup standard for groundwater Tentatively Identified Compounds (TICs) has been incorporated in the PRAP. However, the PRPs and the regulatory authorities had already agreed to the soil standards to be used in the RIFS process and specifically agreed to address TICs as a soil standard protective of groundwater. Changing the PRGs after completion of the approved RIFS process is inconsistent with the Superfund process. Therefore, we respectfully request that the USEPA correct the PRAP to accurately reflect the approved cleanup criteria and PRGs that were used in the RIFS process.

Response 39: This was, indeed, an example of a long RI/FS process. PRGs were used during the RI/FS process based on information, guidance, and standards that were applicable at that time. Prior to EPA's issuance of the Proposed Plan, the State of New York enacted its Environmental Remediation Programs Regulation 6NYCRR Part 375 (effective on December 14, 2006). The NCP requires that the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) or To Be Considered values (TBC) in effect at the time of the issuance of the ROD be used. Furthermore, the remedial action objectives are unaffected by this change and the limited changes in the PRGs have no impact to the implementation of the overall remedy.

Comment 40: As mentioned above, the USEPA has introduced the use of Brownfields requirements under NYSDEC Subpart 375 as part of the PRGs in the PRAP. However, this potential ARAR was never evaluated during the FS

and should not be applied to the Site. The ARARs adopted in the RIFS, which do not include this new potential ARAR under Brownfields, are conservatively protective of Human, Health and the Environment. Therefore, the Brownfields ARAR should not be included in the ROD.

If the USEPA desires to apply Brownfields requirements to the Site then an accurate assessment of the past, current, and future use of the Site needs to be discussed in the context of Brownfields development. The Site is an inactive hazardous waste Site that was utilized for industrial purposes. It is the intent of the land owner to create open space and park land for the Site. We request that USEPA include in the ROD the necessary provisions according to Superfund guidance to allow the cleanup to proceed for the Site beneficial use as open space and park land.

Response 40: EPA uses the PRGs in the PRAP appropriately as explained in the response to Comment 39. The Site is not a Brownfields Site; it is a Superfund Site on the National Priorities List. The Site property is currently zoned for residential/agricultural use, and, as such, residential use is a reasonably anticipated future use of the Site.

Comment 41: The referenced remedy is incorrectly described in the PRAP. Within the GW2 remedy detailed in the FS and further clarified in Attachment A of the cover letter transmitting the final FS to USEPA, the enhancement of monitored natural attenuation (MNA) by application of oxygen releasing compound (ORC®) is further detailed and states:

"...the need and design details of ORC injection is best addressed in the RD if groundwater Alternative #2 is selected in the ROD. Integral to the RD will be the (performance monitoring program) PMP that will specify monitoring of groundwater conditions immediately during and after the implementation of a SVE/biocell. A PMP would be implemented to permit further evaluation of COC and oxidation-reduction potential (ORP) indicator trends after remediation of the lagoon area soils. The details will also include the monitoring well network, analytical parameters, the frequency of sampling, and the need for ORC® applications. Depending on the results of ground water sampling, ORC® applications may not be required..."

We believe the reference to GW2 as enhanced bioremediation is incorrect and more accurately reflects a hybrid remedy similar to GW4 which is based on ORC® treatments. Therefore, we request that USEPA correct the PRAP with respect to the foregoing to more accurately depict the selected remedy of GW2-Enhanced Monitored Natural Attenuation as specified in the FS and our clarifications to the FS.

Response 41: Alternative GW-2, as expressed in the Proposed Plan, is depicted somewhat differently than Alternative GW2 was expressed in the Feasibility Study Report. The primary distinction is that Alternative 2 as presented in the Proposed Plan would apply oxygenating compounds into the excavated areas of the former lagoons to immediately influence the biodegradation in the aquifers. The Feasibility Study Report, though considering the exact same action, determined that the need and design details of application of oxygenating compounds is best addressed in the Remedial Design.

Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) can be a valid control strategy for managing risks from contaminated groundwater where hydrogeological conditions indicate that the contaminants are conducive to degradation. EPA's guidance indicates that for MNA to be selected, a proposal for MNA must include clear evidence demonstrating that degradation of contaminants is occurring, groundwater conditions are amenable (and will remain amenable) for MNA to occur, and that remedial goals are capable of being met in an adequate time frame. There is currently no clear evidence that degradation of contaminants is occurring or that groundwater conditions are currently amenable for MNA to occur. As such, MNA is not an appropriate remedy for the Site. EPA expects that GW-2 will affect current groundwater conditions beneficially so that, after the application of oxygenating compounds (for example, ORCs®), groundwater conditions would be amenable to biodegradation of contaminants. EPA's expectations will be verified through long-term groundwater monitoring. The reference to GW-2 as "Enhanced Bioremediation with Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring," therefore, more accurately depicts the intention to remediate groundwater emanating from the former lagoon area.

Comment 42: The approved FS was based on the point of compliance for groundwater being at the edge of the waste management unit - the biocell. As noted by USEPA, this is consistent with federal Superfund guidance. We believe the PRAP incorrectly implies that all of the groundwater beneath the Site must meet the PRGs. We respectfully request that USEPA correct the PRAP to indicate that the point of compliance for groundwater is the edge of the biocell consistent with the FS and Superfund guidance.

Response 42: EPA indicates in the PRAP that all of the groundwater beneath the Site must meet the PRGs. The implication that the biocell is a waste management unit, as defined in EPA literature, is incorrect. The biocell is a temporary treatment unit. As such, final cleanup levels for contaminated groundwater should be attained throughout the entire contaminant plume, as the goal of the remedy is to return the aquifer to drinking water standards. The expectation is that the entire excavated area of the former lagoons will be treated with oxygenating compounds prior to backfilling and construction of the biocell.

Comment 43: A principle objective for the Site is the protection of potable water supplies. While there are no current impacts and implementation of the remedial actions will further ensure against any impacts in the future, we expected the PRAP to discuss a contingency in the event that potable water wells are impacted above drinking water standards. We would expect a contingency to be included in the ROD for well head treatment in the event of this highly unlikely possibility.

Response 43: In the event that monitoring should indicate that the Village of Maybrook public water supply wells have been impacted by the Site-related contaminants above health-based levels, a contingency plan is necessary to provide for a wellhead treatment for the Village of Maybrook wells on an interim basis pending further consideration of groundwater treatment alternatives to meet groundwater treatment standards.

Comment 44: In discussing the costs for remedial alternatives evaluated in the FS, the USEPA did not reference the range of costs from the FS, rather the maximum costs for each alternative was presented in the PRAP. We believe this is misleading as the cost ranges reflect both the cost uncertainty and options within the design of those remedies. We respectfully request that USEPA correct the PRAP to more accurately reflect the range of costs used in the FS evaluations.

Response 44: Cost information was provided in the Feasibility Study Report for the remedial alternatives presented in the PRAP. As noted in this comment, the FS Report provided a range of costs for each alternative. The EPA presented the maximum cost in the range as a conservative estimate of remedy costs. For further information on these ranges of costs, we direct attention to the FS Report which is in the Administrative Record.

Comment 45: Warner Lambert respectfully requests confirmation of the following:

1. The PRG for pyridine-related TICs was developed using the guidance from 6NYCRR §702.15.
2. The PRG is a guidance value that applies to each individual pyridine-related TIC.
3. The application of the "general organic guidance value" is consistent with the guidance provided in the Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS) 1.1.1 - Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values and Groundwater Effluent Limitations.

Response 45: The PRG for pyridine-related TICs (tentatively identified compounds) were developed by NYSDEC, using the methodology which is described in NYSDEC's letter, dated August 14, 1996 which is in the Administrative Record.

Comment 46: Regarding the perimeter fence, it should be noted that the fence may be removed after remediation of soils and when an adequate vegetative cover is established within the lagoon area.

Response 46: The perimeter fence may be removed once soil cleanup objectives are achieved at the Site.

Comment 47: Besides cost, other issues related to off-Site disposal were presented in the FS. For example, off-Site disposal in a permitted landfill does not reduce the toxicity of contaminants and may present a future contingent liability to the PRPs. Consistent with the National Contingency Plan (NCP), the national goal of remedy selection is to select a remedy that is protective of human health and the environment, maintains protection over time, and minimizes untreated waste. Clearly, Soil Alternative S4 fulfills all three goals, whereas off-Site disposal (Soil Alternative S6) leaves the waste material untreated and partially achieves the goals of the NCP.

Response 47: The EPA conducts a detailed analysis of the remedial alternatives against nine evaluation criteria and a comparative analysis focusing upon the relative performance of each alternative against those criteria. The nine criteria are: overall protection of human health and

the environment; compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements; long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; short-term effectiveness; implementability; cost; state acceptance; and community acceptance. In consideration of these nine criteria, Alternative S4 represented the best balance for these criteria among the alternatives considered and was selected as the preferred remedy.

Comment 48: There is increasing support for the inclusion of sustainable development principles when selecting a remediation technology. We believe Soil Alternative S4 will result in much lower energy consumption and greenhouse gases than Soil Alternative S6, i.e., lower carbon dioxide footprint. The lower carbon dioxide footprint is a direct result from the elimination of transportation vehicles and landfill equipment.

Response 48: Sustainable development principles are not one of the nine evaluation criteria assessed when selecting a remedial alternative. That being said, it seems correct that Soil Alternative S4 would result in lower energy consumption and greenhouse gases than Soil Alternative S6.

Comment 49: Regarding Groundwater Alternative GW-2 (Enhanced Bioremediation), we question whether USEPA's reluctance to call the alternative MNA is driven by OSWER Directive Number 9200.4-17P (USEPA 1999). We respectfully request that the USEPA confirm that the monitoring goal of Groundwater Alternative GW-2 is consistent with the overall objectives of MNA.

Response 49: The goal of the Groundwater Alternative GW-2 is to create aerobic conditions in the groundwater to stimulate biodegradation of the contaminants. Alternative GW-2 also includes a long-term groundwater monitoring program which would monitor the levels of certain natural parameters and the contaminants in the groundwater and determine whether the contaminants are naturally attenuating. In this respect, the monitoring goal of Groundwater Alternative GW-2 is consistent with the overall objectives of MNA.

Comment 50: USEPA also mentions that ORC may need to be applied on multiple occasions. This comment presumes the need, injection location, and frequency of ORC® injection without taking into account the exact groundwater conditions outside the source area of soil contamination... The need and design details of ORC® injection are best addressed in the RD as suggested in the (Proposed) Plan.

Response 50: Oxygenating compounds (for example, ORCs®) will be applied in the areas of the excavated former lagoons. The need and design details of additional ORC® injection (or the injection of any oxygenating compound) will be addressed in the Remedial Design.

Comment 51: "The main assumption using ORC® after excavation is that dissolved oxygen is the limiting groundwater component in the aerobic bioremediation equation. However, the results from the Performance Monitoring Program will indicate the need for ORC® after lagoon soils are excavated from the base and sidewalls of the lagoon area to meet the PRGs for soil. During construction of the biocell, the excavation area will be

dewatered. It is anticipated that the aerobic environment may be restored to localized groundwater, hence, negating the need for ORC®."

Response 51: As explained in the response to Comment 50, oxygenating compounds will be applied in the excavated areas of the former lagoons. Currently, conditions in the subsurface and groundwater beneath the former lagoon area are largely anaerobic. Aerobic conditions would be more conducive than anaerobic conditions for significant biodegradation of the Site-related contaminants to occur. As such, the ROD calls for the application of oxygenating compounds (such as ORC®) into the excavated area to create the necessary aerobic conditions for this biodegradation to occur. The oxygenating compound(s) would be applied and would subsequently spread downward, further into the bedrock aquifer, and spread radially outward in both aquifers, spreading in both directions of groundwater flow. Finally, the need for injection of oxygenating compounds into strategically placed injection wells to supplement the application in the excavated area will be assessed in the Remedial Design.

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

APPENDIX V-a

JULY 2007 PROPOSED PLAN

Superfund Proposed Plan

Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. Superfund Site

Hamptonburgh, Orange County, New York



July 2007

PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PLAN

This Proposed Plan describes the remedial alternatives considered for the contaminated soil and groundwater at the Nepera Chemical Company Superfund Site, and identifies the preferred remedy with the rationale for this preference. This Proposed Plan was developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in consultation with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC).

EPA is issuing this Proposed Plan as part of its public participation responsibilities under Section 117(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended (commonly known as the federal "Superfund" law), and Sections 300.430(f) and 300.435(c) of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP). The nature and extent of the contamination at the site and the alternatives summarized in this Proposed Plan are further described in the June 16, 2006 Remedial Investigation (RI) Report and the June 26, 2007 Feasibility Study (FS) Report, respectively. EPA and NYSDEC encourage the public to review these documents to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the site and Superfund activities that have been conducted at the site.

This Proposed Plan is being provided to inform the public of EPA's preferred remedy and to solicit public comments pertaining to the remedial alternatives evaluated, including the preferred alternatives. EPA's preferred remedy consists of the following components:

Excavation of the soil in the source area (former lagoon area), the design and construction of a biocell to contain the excavated soil, the installation of a soil vapor extraction (SVE) system within the biocell, and operation of the SVE and biocell to remediate contaminated soil. This soil remedial alternative is referred to as Soil Alternative 4 (S4). In addition, the excavated area will be treated with oxygenating compounds (e.g., Oxygen Releasing Compounds) to create an aerobic environment and, thereby, stimulate biodegradation within the area of elevated groundwater contamination. This groundwater remedial alternative is referred to as Groundwater Alternative 2 (GW2). The injection of oxygenating compounds directly into the groundwater at location-specific injection points to further enhance biodegradation of groundwater contamination will be evaluated during the remedial design. This will be followed by a long-term groundwater monitoring program where groundwater samples

Mark Your Calendar

July 31, 2007 – August 29, 2007: Public Comment Period on the Proposed Plan.

August 16, 2007 at 7:00 p.m.: The U.S. EPA will hold a Public Meeting to explain the Proposed Plan. The meeting will be held at Campbell Hall in Hamptonburgh, New York.

For more information, see the Administrative Record file (which will include the Proposed Plan and supporting documents), which is available at the following locations:

Hamptonburgh Town Hall
18 Bull Road
Campbell Hall, New York 10916
Tel. 845-427-2424
Hours: Monday - Friday 9:00am - 3:30pm

and

USEPA-Region II
Superfund Records Center
290 Broadway, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10007-1866
(212) 637-4308
Hours: Monday-Friday, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Written comments on this Proposed Plan should be addressed to:

Mark Dannenberg
Remedial Project Manager
Eastern New York Remediation Section
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
290 Broadway, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10007-1866
Telephone: (212) 637-4251
Telefax: (212) 637-3966
Email address: Dannenberg.mark@epa.gov

The EPA has a web page for the Nepera Chemical Company Site at www.epa.gov/region2/superfund/npl/neperachemical.

would be collected and analyzed regularly in order to verify that the concentrations and the extent of groundwater contaminants are declining. The exact frequency and parameters of sampling and location of any additional monitoring wells would be determined during the design phase.

The remedy described in this Proposed Plan is the preferred remedy for the site. Changes to the preferred remedy or a change from the preferred remedy to another remedy may be made if public comments or additional data indicate that such a change will result in a more appropriate remedial action. The final decision regarding the selected remedy will be made after EPA has taken into consideration all public comments. EPA is soliciting public comment on all of the alternatives considered in this Proposed Plan.

COMMUNITY ROLE IN SELECTION PROCESS

EPA and NYSDEC rely on public input to ensure that the concerns of the community are considered in selecting an effective remedy for each Superfund site. To this end, this Proposed Plan, along with the supporting Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study Reports, have been made available to the public for a public comment period which begins on **July 31, 2007** and concludes on **August 29, 2007**.

A public meeting will be held during the public comment period at Campbell Hall in Hamptonburgh, New York on **August 16, 2007** at 7:00 P.M. to elaborate on the reasons for the proposed remedy and to receive public comments.

Comments received at the public meeting, as well as written comments, will be documented in the Responsiveness Summary Section of the Record of Decision (ROD), the document which formalizes the selection of the remedy.

SCOPE AND ROLE OF ACTION

This Proposed Plan presents the preferred alternatives to remediate the site. The objectives of the proposed remedy are to remediate contaminated soil, reduce and minimize the migration of contaminants in the groundwater, restore groundwater quality, and minimize any potential future health and environmental impacts.

SITE BACKGROUND

Site Description

The property is located on the south side of Orange County Highway 4 in Hamptonburgh, Orange County, New York, approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Village of Maybrook (see Figure 1). The site is owned by Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. (Nepera). The site is 29.3 acres in area; approximately 5 acres of the site were used for the historical lagoon operations (see Figure 2). The site is located in a rural residential/agricultural area, bounded by

Orange County Highway 4 to the north, Beaverdam Brook to the west, the Otter Kill to the south, and an undeveloped tract of land to the east. Three residences exist in the immediate vicinity of the site, one to the southwest, one to the north and one to the northeast (on the other side of Orange County Highway 4).

Approximately 7,000 people live within three miles of the site, with the closest residences located approximately 250 feet to the west-southwest and 175 feet to the northeast. The public water supply wells for the Village of Maybrook are located approximately 800 feet to the northeast of the site property. All residences in the vicinity of the site rely on private wells for the potable water supply.

Site Geology/Hydrogeology

The site is in an area of rolling hill topography and is located within a 4.5 square mile watershed consisting of Beaverdam Brook and its tributaries, which discharge to the Otter Kill, located approximately 500 feet to the south of the property. The geologic units at the site are divided into two primary units, the overburden (comprised of topsoil, fill, and gravel) and the bedrock (comprised of shale). Ground surface topography is generally bedrock controlled in that the ground surface generally follows the bedrock surface topography. The overburden thickness at the site is also related to bedrock topography in that it is generally thinner (or absent) over bedrock ridges, while greater overburden thicknesses have been deposited in bedrock depressions and valleys. The overburden ranges in thickness from 0 to 20 feet.

Most of the site is forested. The former lagoon area, which was stripped of vegetation while in use, is now covered with grasses, wild flowers, and mixed brush. There are two aquifers that exist beneath the site, the overburden aquifer and the bedrock aquifer. The overburden aquifer is the surficial unit which overlies the bedrock aquifer. The bedrock aquifer is the primary source for public water in the area. No significant layers of impeding clays were observed between the two aquifers within the study area. An east to west trending groundwater divide is present in the bedrock aquifer underlying (and transecting) the lagoon area. As such, groundwater flow has a northerly and a southerly component radiating from this divide.

Site History

The site was used for the disposal of industrial wastewater generated at the Nepera Chemical Company facility in Harriman, New York, located approximately 25 miles from the site. Wastewater was trucked to the site and disposed of in six constructed lagoons from 1953 through December 1967. Approximately 5 acres of the site were used for the historical lagoon operations, six lagoons in all. No wastewater disposal has occurred at the Site since December 1967. Three of the lagoons were backfilled with clean soil in 1968 and the remaining three lagoons were backfilled with clean soil in 1974.

Beginning in 1967, numerous investigations were conducted by various consultants to Nepera to determine the extent of contamination at the site. Based on the results of these investigations, NYSDEC placed the site on the New York Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites. On August 17, 1984, the State of New York entered into a Consent Decree with Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. to conduct a remedial investigation to determine the type and extent of contamination at the site.

On June 1, 1986, the EPA placed the Nepera site on the National Priorities List (NPL) of sites under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act 1980 (CERCLA), as amended. NYSDEC continued as the lead regulatory agency overseeing the implementation of the RI/FS.

Under an Administrative Order with NYSDEC, signed on March 21, 1988, the Potentially Responsible Party (PRP), namely Nepera Chemical Company, Inc., hired a contractor to conduct a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) of the site in 1988. The first draft RI was submitted in March 1996. EPA determined that further work was necessary to define the type and extent of soil contamination at the site and to determine the downgradient extent of the contaminant plume which emanated from the site. In March 2005, an updated draft RI was submitted to NYSDEC and USEPA. This document was revised and a Final RI Report was submitted on June 16 2006.

The lead agency for the Nepera site was recently re-designated, at the conclusion of the RI/FS process, from NYSDEC to USEPA.

SUMMARY OF SOIL AND GROUNDWATER SAMPLING

Major RI activities performed during field data collection activities included: on-site soil borings, soil sampling, monitoring well drilling and installation, groundwater sampling, and residential well sampling. The results of the RI are summarized below.

Soil

The PRP performed the RI in several phases. Soil sampling activities were conducted in 1991 and 1996. Focused soil sampling identified contamination in the lagoon area and determined the lagoon area to be the primary source of the contaminants in the groundwater plume. The primary contaminants identified during soil sampling activities include benzene (maximum concentration of 13 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg)), chlorobenzene (maximum concentration of 12 mg/kg), ethylbenzene (maximum concentration of 22 mg/kg), toluene (maximum concentration of 52 mg/kg), xylenes (maximum concentration of 300 mg/kg) and pyridine-related compounds (maximum concentration of 74 mg/kg of 2-amino pyridine). Each of these contaminants are considered as Contaminants of Concern (COCs) for the Site. In addition, several samples detected elevated levels of metals, including mercury and manganese. An additional 120 soil samples were collected from the lagoon

area in 2003 to evaluate concentration levels of metals. Soil samples were also collected from locations not impacted by the site to determine Site-specific background levels for metals. Analytical data from the 2003 sampling activities indicated that the metals in the lagoon area were analogous to background concentrations and, as such, metals are not considered to be COCs. The presence of mercury in earlier samples (from 1991 and 1995) was of additional concern as the form of mercury (e.g., organo-mercury or inorganic mercury) can significantly change its toxicity. As such, additional analyses were performed on selected samples from the 2003 activities to determine form (or species) of mercury present in Site soils. These analyses determined that over 99% of the mercury present in Site soils is in the form of inorganic mercury, which is significantly less toxic than organo-mercury.

As stated earlier, the former lagoons are within an area approximately 5 acres in size, but the total area of the actual six lagoons is smaller. The total area of contaminated soils (i.e., the six lagoons) is estimated to be 128,850 square feet (approximately 3 acres). The volume calculations for contaminated soil are based on the actual surface area of each lagoon, the average depth of the overburden within each lagoon (down to bedrock), the thickness of a distinct black-stained layer observed during the completion of test pits, and the clean fill put on the lagoons. The average overburden thickness was estimated to range from 3.4 (for lagoon 6) to 13.3 feet (for Lagoon 3). The total volume of contaminated soil is estimated to be 30,086 cubic yards. Furthermore, it is estimated that 20% (approximately 6,000 cubic yards) of this is comprised of shale and cobble which will be sorted-out prior to implementing a soil remedy. Therefore, the remedial alternatives assessed in this Proposed Plan are based on the total volume of contaminated soil being 24,086 cubic yards, which is equivalent to approximately 38,700 tons of contaminated soil.

Groundwater

The groundwater monitoring program included sampling of groundwater monitoring wells located at (and bordering) the site and analyses of these samples for organic and inorganic compounds. These efforts were comprised of several separate field mobilizations conducted between 1995 and 2003. The investigation was conducted in an iterative manner, where the results of each task were used to develop the scope of each subsequent task. The RI included:

- Installing permanent groundwater monitoring wells to act as fixed monitoring and/or compliance points within both the overburden aquifer and the bedrock aquifer. A total of 38 groundwater monitoring wells were installed in the study area.
- Collecting a series of groundwater samples from the assembled monitoring network;
- Identifying the Contaminants of Potential Concern in both aquifers;

- Characterizing the horizontal and vertical extent of site-related contaminants in the overburden and bedrock aquifers and determining the extent of the groundwater contaminant plume;

As with the contaminated soil, the primary contaminants identified in groundwater include benzene, chlorobenzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, xylenes and pyridine-related compounds. These contaminants were detected above MCLs in the wells located within the property boundary.

Residences in the vicinity of the site rely on private wells for their potable water supply. As a precautionary measure, to ensure that these wells are not impacted by the Site, private wells in the immediate vicinity of the Site have routinely been sampled for Site-related contaminants. With the exception of minor levels of Site-related contaminants detected below drinking water standards (e.g., MCLs) in May 2002 and September 2003, sampling data indicates nondetectable levels of Site-related contaminants in private wells. Also, because of their close proximity to the Site (approximately 800 feet), the public wells located on County Highway 4, which are used to supply drinking water to customers served by the Village of Maybrook, are monitored on a quarterly basis for Site-related contaminants and must comply with the New York State Department of Health drinking water standards. Site-related contaminants have not been detected in the Village of Maybrook Public Wells.

Sediment

As stated earlier, the Site is bounded by Beaverdam Brook to the west and the Otter Kill to the south. Since the hydrogeological link between groundwater and these water bodies was not clear, sediment samples were collected in 1985, 1991, and 1995 from Beaverdam Brook and the Otter Kill.

The EPA performed additional sediment sampling from the floor of Beaverdam Brook in 2003. Groundwater flow direction was considered to determine sampling location points. Samples were collected from a total of 27 sampling locations, upstream, downstream, and adjacent to the Site, and were analyzed for volatile organic compounds and semi-volatile organic compounds (including Site-related COCs). Site-related COCs were not detected in these samples.

RISK SUMMARY

The purpose of the risk assessment is to identify potential cancer risks and noncancer health hazards at the site assuming that no further remedial action is taken. A baseline human health risk assessment was performed to evaluate current and future cancer risks and noncancer health hazards based on the results of the Remedial Investigation.

WHAT IS RISK AND HOW IS IT CALCULATED?

A Superfund baseline human health risk assessment is an analysis of the potential adverse health effects caused by hazardous substance releases from a site in the absence of any actions to control or mitigate these under current- and future-land uses. A four-step process is utilized for assessing site-related human health risks for reasonable maximum exposure scenarios.

Hazard Identification: In this step, the contaminants of concern (COC) at a site in various media (*i.e.*, soil, groundwater, surface water, and air) are identified based on such factors as toxicity, frequency of occurrence, and fate and transport of the contaminants in the environment, concentrations of the contaminants in specific media, mobility, persistence, and bioaccumulation.

Exposure Assessment: In this step, the different exposure pathways through which people might be exposed to the contaminants identified in the previous step are evaluated. Examples of exposure pathways include incidental ingestion of and dermal contact with contaminated soil. Factors relating to the exposure assessment include, but are not limited to, the concentrations that people might be exposed to and the potential frequency and duration of exposure. Using these factors, a "reasonable maximum exposure" scenario, which portrays the highest level of human exposure that could reasonably be expected to occur, is calculated.

Toxicity Assessment: In this step, the types of adverse health effects associated with chemical exposures and the relationship between magnitude of exposure and severity of adverse effects are determined. Potential health effects are chemical-specific and may include the risk of developing cancer over a lifetime or other noncancer health effects, such as changes in the normal functions of organs within the body (*e.g.*, changes in the effectiveness of the immune system). Some chemicals are capable of causing both cancer and noncancer health effects.

Risk Characterization: This step summarizes and combines outputs of the exposure and toxicity assessments to provide a quantitative assessment of site risks. Exposures are evaluated based on the potential risk of developing cancer and the potential for non-cancer health hazards. The likelihood of an individual developing cancer is expressed as a probability. For example, a 10^{-4} cancer risk means a "one-in-ten-thousand excess cancer risk"; or one additional cancer may be seen in a population of 10,000 people as a result of exposure to site contaminants under the conditions explained in the Exposure Assessment. Current Superfund guidelines for acceptable exposures are an individual lifetime excess cancer risk in the range of 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} (corresponding to a one-in-ten-thousand to a one-in-a-million excess cancer risk) with 10^{-6} being the point of departure. For noncancer health effects, a "hazard index" (HI) is calculated. An HI represents the sum of the individual exposure levels compared to their corresponding reference doses. The key concept for a non-cancer HI is that a "threshold level" (measured as an HI of less than 1) exists below which non-cancer health effects are not expected to occur.

A baseline ecological risk assessment was also conducted to assess the risk posed to ecological receptors due to site-related contamination.

Human Health Risk Assessment

As part of the RI/FS, a baseline human health risk assessment was conducted to estimate the risks associated with the current and future effects of contaminants on human health and the environment. A baseline human health risk assessment is an analysis of the potential adverse human health effects caused by hazardous-substance exposure in the absence of any actions to control or mitigate these under current and future land uses. A four-step human health risk assessment process was used for assessing site-related cancer risks and noncancer health hazards. The four-step process is comprised of: Hazard Identification of Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPCs), Exposure Assessment, Toxicity Assessment, and Risk Characterization (see adjoining box "What is Risk and How is it Calculated").

The human health risk estimates summarized below are based on reasonable maximum exposure scenarios and were developed by taking into account various conservative estimates about the frequency and duration of an individual's exposure to the site-related contaminants both for adults and children, as well as the toxicity of these contaminants.

The baseline risk assessment began with selecting COPCs in the various media (e.g., soil and groundwater) that would be representative of site risks. The property is currently zoned as agricultural/residential. Though the land is currently undeveloped, the reasonably anticipated future land use, based on its current zoning, is residential. As such, the risk assessment was based on a future anticipated residential land-use scenario (the most conservative scenario), though, an open-space, park setting was also considered in the baseline risk assessment. In addition, the potential future use of groundwater as a drinking water source is consistent with the State use designation of the aquifer. The baseline risk assessment considered health effects for trespassers/hikers, maintenance workers, and residents who may be exposed to contaminants in the soils by ingestion, inhalation, and dermal contact, and ingestion and inhalation of groundwater used as a potable water supply. In this assessment, exposure point concentrations were estimated using either the maximum detected concentration of a contaminant or the 95 percent upper confidence limit of the average concentration. Chronic daily intakes were calculated based on the reasonable maximum exposure (RME), which is the highest exposure reasonably anticipated to occur at the site. The RME is intended to estimate a conservative exposure scenario that is still within the range of possible exposures. Central tendency exposure (CTE) assumptions, which represent typical average exposures, were also developed. A

complete summary of all exposure scenarios can be found in the baseline human health risk assessment.

Human Health Risks

In the Human Health Risk Assessment, chemical data were used to calculate cancer risks and noncancer health hazards expressed as individual Hazard Quotients (HQ). These cancer and noncancer risks, for the most conservative scenario (namely, future residential use of the Site) are expressed below.

EPA's statistical analysis of the groundwater sampling data indicates that the probable exposure concentrations of benzene (330 ug/l), xylenes (270 ug/l), 2-aminopyridine (189 ug/l), and aniline (16 ug/l), when evaluated under future residential exposure scenarios, are associated with noncancer hazard quotients of 21, 4, 570, and 23, respectively. In addition, the concentration of benzene is associated with an excess lifetime cancer risk of 1×10^{-3} . All of these values exceed EPA's acceptable levels of noncancer hazard or excess lifetime cancer risk.

Similarly, EPA's evaluation of the soils indicates that direct exposure to the probable exposure concentrations of benzene (4,440 ug/kg), toluene (10,000 ug/kg), chlorobenzene (1,000 ug/kg), xylenes (69,000 ug/kg), and 2-aminopyridine (23,400 ug/kg) are associated with hazard quotients of 42, 7, 5, 61, and 2, respectively. All of these values exceed EPA's acceptable levels of noncancer hazard. In addition, the concentration of benzene is associated with an excess lifetime cancer risk of 1×10^{-4} .

These risk and hazard levels indicate that there is significant potential risk to receptors from direct exposure to contaminated soil and groundwater. The risk estimates are based on current reasonable maximum exposure scenarios and were developed by taking into account conservative assumptions about the frequency and duration of an individuals' exposure to the soil and groundwater, as well as the toxicity of these chemicals.

These calculated risks to human health indicate that action is necessary by EPA to undertake remedial measures to reduce the risks associated with the observed contamination in soil and groundwater and restore the groundwater to beneficial use.

Ecological Risk Assessment

A baseline ecological risk assessment (BERA) was prepared to identify the potential environmental risks associated with surface water, groundwater, sediment, and soil. The results of the BERA suggested that there are contaminants in groundwater, soils, and sediment, but they are not present at levels posing significant risks to ecological receptors. The potential for risk to ecological receptors exposed to site-related contaminants was limited to isolated locations, primarily in Lagoon 6, and the risk associated with this area used

the conservative assumption that the ecological receptors (e.g., soil invertebrates, mammalian insectivores, and carnivores) spend 100% of their lives in the area of Lagoon 6. The contaminants that were identified in the BERA (outside of Lagoon 6) were determined not to pose a potential for adverse ecological effects because they were common elements of soil that were not related to Site operations, the detected concentrations were lower than background levels, the frequency of detections was low, or the HQs were only slightly above 1 with no adverse impacts to populations expected. A detailed presentation of these data can be found in the RI Report.

Risk Summary Conclusion

Exposure to contaminated soil poses risks to human health. Furthermore, the contaminated soil continues to be a source of groundwater contamination. As such, it was decided that a remedial action should be taken to reduce contamination in the soil to levels below cleanup objectives. In addition, exposure to contaminated groundwater poses risks to human health. As such, it was decided that a remedial action should be taken to restore the contaminated groundwater for future use.

REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES

Remedial action objectives (RAOs) are media-specific goals to protect human health and the environment. These objectives are based on available information and standards such as applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), to-be-considered (TBC) guidance, and risk-based levels established in the risk assessment.

The overall remedial action objective is to ensure the protection of human health and the environment. The general remedial objectives identified for the Site are to:

1. prevent exposure, to contaminated soils and contaminated groundwater, to human and ecological receptors;
2. minimize migration of contaminants from soils to groundwater;
3. restore the aquifer(s) to beneficial use;
4. ensure that hazardous constituents within the soil and groundwater meet acceptable levels consistent with reasonably anticipated future use; and
5. minimize potential human contact with waste constituents.

Preliminary Remediation Goals

Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) were selected based on federal and state promulgated ARARs, risk-based levels, background concentrations, and guidance values. These PRGs were then used as a benchmark in the technology screening, alternative development and screening, and detailed evaluation of alternatives presented in the subsequent sections of the FS Report. The PRGs for groundwater and soil are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Preliminary Remediation Goals

Contaminant	PRG for Groundwater (ug/L) *	PRG for Soils (ug/kg)
Benzene	1	60 ***
Chlorobenzene	5	1,100 ***
Ethylbenzene	5	1,000 ***
Toluene	5	700 ***
Xylenes	5	1,600 ***
2-amino pyridine	1	400 ****
Pyridine	50	400 ****
Alpha picoline	50	575 ****
Acetone	50	50 ***
Aniline	5	1,510 ****
Pyridine-related tentatively identified compounds	50	400 ****

* Groundwater cleanup levels for organic COCs are based on the more conservative of the Federal Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) and the New York Ambient Groundwater Standards and Guidance Values (NYSDEC TOGs 1.1.1, June 1998).

*** The values shown are from *NYSDEC Subpart 375: Remedial Program Soil Cleanup Objectives*.

**** The values shown were derived by NYSDEC based on the *Division Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum: Determination of Soil Cleanup Objectives and Cleanup Levels, Division of Hazardous Waste Remediation, January 24, 1994*.

SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

CERCLA Section 121(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. Section 9621(b)(1), mandates that remedial actions must be protective of human health and the environment, cost-effective, comply with other statutory laws (ARARs), and utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies and resource recovery alternatives to the maximum extent practicable. Section 121(b)(1) also establishes a preference for remedial actions which employ, as a principal element, treatment to permanently and significantly reduce the volume, toxicity, or mobility of the hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants at a site. CERCLA Section 121(d), 42 U.S.C. Section 9621(d) further specifies that a remedial action must attain a level or standard of control of the hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants, which at least attains ARARs under federal and state laws, unless a waiver can be justified pursuant to CERCLA Section 121(d)(4), 42 U.S.C. Section 9621(d)(4).

The objective of the feasibility study (FS) was to identify and evaluate cost-effective remedial action alternatives which would minimize the risk to public health and the environment resulting from soil and groundwater contamination at the site.

Detailed descriptions of the remedial alternatives for addressing the contamination associated with the site

can be found in the FS report. This document presents a summary of the six soil remediation alternatives and five groundwater remediation alternatives that were evaluated.

The remedial alternatives are described below.

Common Elements for All Alternatives

All alternatives would include institutional controls. Specifically, an environmental easement/restrictive covenant would be filed in the property records of Orange County. The easement/covenant would, at a minimum, require: (a) with the exception of Alternative S6 – Excavation and Off-Site Disposal, restricting any excavation below the soil surface layer in those areas undergoing remediation, unless the excavation activities are in compliance with an EPA approved site management plan; (b) restricting new construction at the Site unless an evaluation of the potential for vapor intrusion is conducted and mitigation, if necessary, is performed in compliance with an EPA approved site management plan; (c) restricting the use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water unless groundwater quality standards are met; and (d) the owner/operator to complete and submit periodic certifications that the institutional and engineering controls are in place.

A Site Management Plan (SMP) would be developed to address soils and groundwater at the Site. The SMP would provide for the proper management of all Site remedy components post-construction, such as institutional controls, and shall also include: (a) monitoring of Site groundwater to ensure that, following the soil excavation, the contamination is attenuating and groundwater quality continues to improve; (b) identification of any use restrictions on the Site; (c) necessary provisions for implementation of the requirements of the above easement/covenant; and (d) provision for any operation and maintenance required of the components of the remedy.

In addition, physical controls, such as regular maintenance of the perimeter fence, would be implemented to restrict Site access and thereby prevent the potential exposure to chemicals present in the soils in the vicinity of the former lagoons.

Finally, all groundwater remedial alternatives would include the requirement that those private wells, in the vicinity of the Site, currently being monitored in relation to this Site will continue to be monitored on an ongoing basis. The frequency of the residential well sampling will be determined during Remedial Design.

Soil Remedial Alternatives

Alternative S1 - No Action

Capital Cost:	\$0
Annual Cost:	\$0
Present-Worth Cost:	\$0
Construction Time:	Not Applicable

The "No Action" alternative is considered in accordance with NCP requirements and provides a baseline for comparison with other alternatives. If this alternative were implemented, the current status of the site would remain unchanged. Institutional controls would not be implemented to restrict future site development or use. Engineering controls would not be implemented to prevent site access or exposure to site contaminants. Although existing security fencing at the site would remain, it would not be monitored or maintained under this alternative.

Alternative S2 – Institutional Controls with Limited Actions

Capital Cost:	\$12,600
Annual Cost:	\$13,550
Present-Worth Cost:	\$217,000
Construction Time:	3 months

This alternative is comprised of the institutional controls mentioned previously. Physical controls would also be used to eliminate the future potential for on-Site exposures. A perimeter security fence (with appropriate warning signs) has been constructed to restrict Site access and thereby prevent the potential exposure to chemicals present in the surface soils in the vicinity of the former lagoons. The Site security fencing and warning signs would be routinely inspected and maintained at the Site to restrict access to the Site.

Institutional controls as the sole remedy would not be an adequate substitute for engineering controls at this Site. This Alternative would not achieve the Remedial Action Objectives. Accordingly, this alternative will not be retained for further consideration. Institutional controls, however, as described in this alternative, will be retained as components of other remedial alternatives.

Alternative S3 – Installation of a Cap Over the Contaminated Soils

Capital Cost:	\$2,290,000
Annual Cost:	\$24,000
Present-Worth Cost:	\$2,647,000
Construction Time:	8 months

Under this alternative, a cap would be constructed over the area with contaminated soils. This area has soils above the water table with concentrations exceeding the NYSDEC Soil Cleanup Objectives.

Chemicals in the soils above the water table would be contained by a cap. The cap would serve to inhibit infiltration of precipitation and thereby reduce leaching of chemicals from the soils to groundwater, and, therefore, reduce chemical concentrations in the overburden and bedrock groundwater over time. The decreased infiltration over the former lagoon area would result in a lowering of the water table in the overburden aquifer directly beneath the Site and, hence, further reduce the chemical migration from this area via groundwater transport.

Alternative S4 – Excavation and On-Site SVE and Biocell

Capital Cost:	\$2,388,000
Annual Cost:	\$406,000
Present-Worth Cost:	\$3,119,000
Construction Time:	2 years

This alternative would involve the excavation of the soils within the former lagoons and treatment of the soils with concentrations of Contaminants of Concern (COCs) exceeding the NYSDEC Soil Cleanup Objectives on-Site utilizing SVE and biological degradation within an engineered below-grade biocell. Excavated soils would be treated to reach target cleanup levels.

The soils would be treated within the biocell by installing perforated pipes within multiple layers of the biocell. The perforated pipes would be connected to a blower unit to draw air through the piles; contaminants would be volatilized into this air. The air would be treated, if necessary, using carbon adsorption, prior to being recirculated or exhausted to the atmosphere. Nutrients would be added to the treatment layers as required to enhance biological degradation.

In general, the biocell would be operated in two primary modes: SVE mode (high air flow rate); and bioremediation mode (low air flow rate).

During the SVE mode, the system would be operated at higher air flow rates which would be selected to optimize the removal of the volatile organic compounds (VOCs) constituents using SVE. After the removal rate of the

VOCs decreases to an asymptotic or nominal rate, the system would be switched over to the bioremediation mode. During the bioremediation mode, the system would be operated at an optimized air flow rate selected to sustain the aerobic biodegradation of the remaining VOCs and semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs).

Alternative S5 – In-Situ Soil Vacuum Extraction

Capital Cost:	\$1,211,000
Annual Cost:	\$460,900
Present-Worth Cost:	\$2,302,000
Construction Time:	4 years

This alternative involves the installation of an in situ soil vacuum extraction system (ISVE) in the area identified for potential soil remediation. A drainage swale would be constructed along the edge of the treatment area to prevent surface water run-on to the treatment area.

The soil vapor extraction wells would be strategically placed within the area of soil to be treated to ensure that airflow within the area is maximized. The extraction wells would consist of a screened section of pipe (or pipes) placed in a permeable packing with the top few feet of the well grouted to prevent the short circuit of airflow from the surface. An impermeable temporary cap would be placed over the treatment area to minimize infiltration of precipitation, lower the water table and increase the volume of the unsaturated zone, and prevent short circuiting of airflow directly from the surface.

The extraction wells would be installed with vacuum and positive pressures being applied at alternating well locations to create an induced pressure gradient to move the vapors through the soil. Extracted vapors would be treated utilizing carbon filters, if required, prior to being reinjected or exhausted to the atmosphere. Vapor-phase nutrients would also be injected into the soils, if needed, to enhance biodegradation.

Alternative S6 – Excavation and Off-Site Disposal

Capital Cost:	\$11,208,000
Annual Cost:	\$22,000
Present-Worth Cost:	\$11,228,000
Construction Time:	1 year

Alternative S6 involves the excavation of soils within the former lagoons containing COCs at concentrations exceeding NYSDEC Soil Cleanup Objectives. The excavated soils would be disposed of off Site at an appropriate landfill.

The Capital Cost associated with Alternative S6, as reported in the FS Report, has a significant range because it is not exactly known how much of the contaminated soil would be classified as hazardous waste and would, therefore, be more expensive to handle and dispose. The Capital Cost cited above represents the high end of the range. The Capital Cost associated with the low end of the range is \$5,736,000.

Alternative S6 would include the following major components:

- pre-design investigation;
- excavation of on-site soils exceeding soil cleanup objectives for the COCs;
- post excavation sampling to verify achievement of soil cleanup objectives;
- disposal of excavated soils at appropriate off-site facility (or facilities);
- backfilling of excavated areas with clean fill.

Groundwater Remedial Alternatives

Alternative GW1 – No Action

Capital Cost: \$0
 Annual Cost: \$0
 Present-Worth Cost: \$0
 Duration Time: 0 months

The No Action alternative was retained for comparison purposes as required by the NCP. No remedial actions would be implemented as part of this alternative. Groundwater would continue to migrate and contamination would continue to attenuate through dilution. This alternative does not include institutional controls or long-term groundwater monitoring.

Alternative GW2 – Enhanced Bioremediation with Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring

Capital Cost: \$13,200
 Annual Cost: \$106,700
 Present-Worth Cost: \$528,000
 Duration Time: 8 years

This alternative involves the manipulation of Site groundwater conditions to enhance in situ bioremediation of the COCs by the indigenous microbial population. The design details for enhanced bioremediation would be established following the removal of the source area soils. The excavated area will be treated with oxygenating compounds to create an aerobic environment and,

thereby, stimulate biodegradation within the area of elevated groundwater contamination. Multiple applications of the oxygenating compounds may be necessary. This will be followed by a long-term groundwater monitoring program where groundwater samples would be collected and analyzed regularly in order to verify that the concentrations and the extent of groundwater contaminants are declining. The exact frequency and parameters of sampling and location of any additional monitoring wells would be determined during the design phase. The site-related COCs are susceptible to degradation in aerobic conditions. To enhance aerobic biodegradation outside of the source area, the remedial design will consider the controlled, location-specific injection(s) of oxygenating compounds into the groundwater contamination plume(s) at various locations to stimulate biodegradation of COCs. Multiple injections over time may also be necessary for this action to be fully effective.

The groundwater monitoring program would be conducted to ensure that this remedy was protective, that the concentrations of COCs were attenuating, and to evaluate the rates of biodegradation/bioremediation (in both the bedrock and overburden aquifers).

Alternative GW3 – Groundwater Extraction and Treatment (Pump And Treat)

Capital Cost: \$1,656,000
 Annual Cost: \$229,000
 Present-Worth Cost: \$3,339,000
 Duration Time: 13 years

Under this alternative, an overburden and bedrock groundwater collection system would be installed downgradient of each area with identified soil and groundwater concentrations above the potential cleanup levels. The components of this alternative include the installation of several strategically located bedrock groundwater extraction wells and a water table tile collection system installed in two areas of the overburden (downgradient of the source area to capture both the north and south components of the groundwater flow from the source area). The collection systems would be designed to minimize the migration of contaminants in groundwater and to restore the aquifer(s) to beneficial use. The bedrock extraction wells would pipe contaminated groundwater to a groundwater treatment system for treatment; the tile collection system would route contaminated groundwater in the overburden to the groundwater treatment system for treatment. This alternative would prevent the potential migration of chemicals off Site via groundwater transport. The collected groundwater would be treated via a carbon adsorption system located along the western edge of the Site to meet discharge standards as well as water quality requirements for discharge to Beaverdam Brook.

An ongoing groundwater monitoring program would be conducted to ensure that this remedy was protective.

Alternative GW4 – Enhanced Bioremediation

Capital Cost:	\$332,000
Annual Cost:	\$106,700
Present-Worth Cost:	\$846,000
Duration Time:	8 years

This alternative involves the manipulation of Site groundwater conditions to enhance in situ bioremediation of the COCs by the indigenous microbial population. The design details for enhanced bioremediation would be established following the treatment/removal of the source area soils. Treatment would involve either the controlled injection of oxygenating compounds (e.g., Oxygen Releasing Compounds (ORCs)) to enhance biodegradation of the COCs or the controlled injection of a chemical oxidizer (e.g., hydrogen peroxide) and nutrients into the groundwater contamination plumes to chemically convert the organic contamination into nonhazardous compounds. The preliminary design assumes that 440 injection points would be required for the injection of ORC into the overburden groundwater. The area would encompass both the source area and locations downgradient of the source area, including both the north and south components of the groundwater flow. Multiple injections over time may be necessary for this action to be fully effective.

An ongoing groundwater monitoring program would be conducted to ensure that this remedy was protective, that the concentrations of COCs were attenuating, and to evaluate the rates of biodegradation/bioremediation (in both the bedrock and overburden aquifers).

Alternative GW5 – Biosparging

Capital Cost:	\$191,000
Annual Cost:	\$106,700
Present-Worth Cost:	\$738,000
Duration Time:	8 years

Under this alternative, pressurized gas (i.e., oxygen) would be injected into the groundwater at very low flowrates to enhance bioremediation. Specifically, the biosparging technology considered here is "in situ Submerged Oxygen Curtain" (iSOC). This technology injects supersaturated oxygen into the groundwater such that oxygen is infused into groundwater without the formation of bubbles. This prevents vapors (e.g., the bubbles) from entering the vadose zone. The vadose zone is that portion of the soil between the land surface and the zone of saturation, or, in

other words, the vadose zone extends from the ground surface to the water table.

An ongoing groundwater monitoring program would be conducted to ensure that this remedy was protective.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In selecting a remedy for a site, EPA considers the factors set forth in CERCLA §121, 42 U.S.C. §9621, by conducting a detailed analysis of the viable remedial alternatives pursuant to the NCP, 40 CFR §300.430(e)(9) and OSWER Directive 9355.3-01. The detailed analysis consists of an assessment of the individual alternatives against each of nine evaluation criteria and a comparative analysis focusing upon the relative performance of each alternative against those criteria.

- Overall protection of human health and the environment addresses whether or not a remedy provides adequate protection and describes how risks posed through each exposure pathway (based on a reasonable maximum exposure scenario) are eliminated, reduced, or controlled through treatment, engineering controls, or institutional controls.
- Compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements addresses whether or not a remedy would meet all of the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements of other federal and state environmental statutes and regulations or provide grounds for invoking a waiver.
- Long-Term effectiveness and permanence refer to the ability of a remedy to maintain reliable protection of human health and the environment over time, once cleanup goals have been met. It also addresses the magnitude and effectiveness of the measures that may be required to manage the risk posed by treatment residuals and/or untreated wastes.
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment is the anticipated performance of the treatment technologies, with respect to these parameters, a remedy may employ.
- Short-Term effectiveness addresses the period of time needed to achieve protection and any adverse impacts on human health and the environment that may be posed during the construction and implementation period until cleanup goals are achieved.
- Implementability is the technical and administrative feasibility of a remedy, including the availability of materials and services needed to implement a particular option.

- Cost includes estimated capital and operation and maintenance costs, and net present-worth costs.
- State acceptance indicates whether, based on its review of the RI/FS reports and the Proposed Plan, the State concurs with, opposes, or has no comment on the preferred remedy at the present time.
- Community acceptance will be assessed in the ROD, and refers to the public's general response to the alternatives described in the Proposed Plan and the RI/FS reports.

A comparative analysis (one for soils and one for groundwater) of these alternatives, based upon the evaluation criteria noted above, follows.

Comparative Analysis for Soils

- Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment

Alternatives S1 and S2 would not be protective of human health and the environment, since they would not actively address the contaminated soils, which present unacceptable risks of exposure and are a source of groundwater contamination. Alternative S3 would be protective of human health and the environment in that the cap would prevent exposure to contaminated soil and would also serve to minimize infiltration of precipitation and thereby reduce leaching of chemicals from the soils to groundwater, hence, reducing contamination of the groundwater; however, Alternative S3 would not actively remediate contaminated soil. Alternatives S4, S5, and S6 would be protective of human health and the environment, since each alternative relies upon a remedial strategy or treatment technology capable of eliminating human exposure and removing the source of groundwater contamination.

- Compliance with ARARs

The soil cleanup objectives used for the Site are based on NYSDEC values (*NYSDEC Subpart 375: Remedial Program Soil Cleanup Objectives - and/or- NYSDEC's Division Technical and Administrative Guidance Memorandum: Determination of Soil Cleanup Objectives and Cleanup Levels, Division of Hazardous Waste Remediation, January 24, 1994.*) These NYSDEC soil cleanup objectives were utilized as PRGs for the site-related contaminants.

Since the contamination in the soils would not be addressed under Alternatives S1 and S2, they would not achieve the soil cleanup objectives. While the cap installed under Soil Alternative S3 would comply with RCRA design standards, this

alternative would not actively remediate contaminated soil and, as such, would not achieve the soil cleanup objectives. Alternatives S4 and S5 would each attain the soil cleanup objectives specified. Alternative S6 would involve the excavation and removal of the contaminated soil from the site, and thereby achieve soil cleanup objectives for the Site property.

Alternatives S4 and S6 both involve the excavation of contaminated soils and would, therefore, require compliance with fugitive dust and VOC emission regulations. In addition, Alternative S6 would be subject to New York State and federal regulations related to the transportation and off-site treatment/disposal of wastes. In the case of Alternatives S4 and S5, compliance with air emission standards would be required for the SVE or ISVE system. Specifically, treatment of off-gases would have to meet the substantive requirements of New York State Regulations for Prevention and Control of Air Contamination and Air Pollution (6 NYCRR Part 200, et seq.) and comply with the substantive requirements of other state and federal air emission standards.

- Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence

Alternatives S1 and S2 would not involve any active remedial measures, and, as such, not be effective in eliminating the potential exposure to contaminants in soil and would result in the continued migration of contaminants from the soil to the groundwater. Alternative 3 involves installation of a landfill cover which would eliminate the potential exposure to contaminants in the soil and also reduce leaching of contaminants from the soil to groundwater. Alternatives S4, S5, and S6 would each be effective in the long term by either removing the contaminated soils from the Site or treating them in place.

- Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility or Volume

Alternatives S1 and S2 would provide no reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume of contaminants. Alternative S3 would reduce the migration of contaminants from soil to groundwater but would not provide a reduction in toxicity or volume of contaminants. Alternatives S4 and S5 would reduce toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminants through on-site treatment. Under Alternative S6, the toxicity, mobility, and volume of the contaminants would be eliminated by removing contaminated soil from the Site property.

- Short-Term Effectiveness

Alternative S1 and S2 do not include any physical construction measures in any areas of contamination and, therefore, would not present any potential adverse impacts to on-property workers or the community as a result of their implementation. Alternatives S3, S4, S5, and S6 could result in some adverse impacts to on-property workers through dermal contact and inhalation related to the installation of the remedial systems associated with each of these alternatives. Alternatives S4 and S6 involve significant excavation activities that would need to be properly managed to prevent or minimize adverse impacts. For instance, excavation activities would need to be properly managed to prevent transport of fugitive dust and exposure of workers through dermal contact and by inhalation of volatile organic compounds in the air. Noise from the treatment unit and the excavation work associated with Alternatives S3, S4, S5, and S6 could present some limited adverse impacts to on-property workers, while truck traffic related to Alternative S6 could provide nuisance impacts (e.g., noise and traffic) to nearby residents. In addition, interim and post-remediation soil sampling activities would pose some risk to on-property workers. The risks to on-property workers and nearby residents under all of the alternatives could, however, be mitigated by following appropriate health and safety protocols, by exercising sound engineering practices, and by using proper protective equipment.

Alternatives S4 and S6 involve significant excavation activities that would need to be properly managed to prevent or minimize adverse impacts. For instance, excavation activities would need to be properly managed to prevent transport of fugitive dust and exposure of workers to volatile organic compounds in the air.

Since no actions would be performed under Alternative S1, there would be no implementation time. Since only limited actions would be performed under Alternative S2, there would be very little implementation time. It is estimated that Alternative S3 would require 3 months to complete the landfill cap, Alternative S4 would require 2 years to complete, Alternative S5 would require 4 years to complete, and Alternative S6 would require approximately one year to complete.

- Implementability

Alternatives S1 and S2 would be the easiest soil alternatives to implement in that there are no field activities to undertake.

Alternatives S3, S4, S5, and S6 would all employ technologies known to be reliable (though the biocell proposed as a component of Alternative S4

is a lesser known technology relative to the site-related COCs) and that can be readily implemented. In addition, equipment, services, and materials needed for these alternatives are readily available, and the actions under these alternatives would be administratively feasible. Furthermore, sufficient facilities are available for the treatment/disposal of the excavated materials under Alternative S6.

Monitoring the effectiveness of the SVE system (in Alternative S4), and the ISVE system (in Alternative S5) would be easily accomplished through soil and soil-vapor sampling and analysis. Under Alternatives S4, S5, and S6, determining the extent of soil cleanup would be easily accomplished through post-excavation soil sampling and analysis.

- Cost

The estimated capital, annual operation and maintenance (O&M) (including monitoring), and present-worth costs for each of the soil remediation alternatives are presented in Table 2. All costs are presented in U.S. Dollars.

Table 2: Cost Analysis for Soil Remediation Alternatives

Remedial Alternative	Capital Cost	Annual O&M Cost	Present Worth Cost	Construction Time
S1	0	950	15,000	No time
S2	12,600	13,550	217,000	Months
S3	2,290,000	24,000	2,647,000	Several months to install cap
S4	2,388,000	406,000	3,119,000	2 years
S5	1,211,000	460,900	2,302,000	4 years
S6	5,736,000	22,000	5,756,000	1 year

According to the capital cost, O&M cost and present worth cost estimates, Alternative S1 has the lowest cost and Alternative S6 has the highest cost when comparing all Alternatives.

Comparative Analysis for Groundwater

- Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment

All alternatives except GW1 would provide adequate protection of human health and the environment. As noted above in the risk assessment section, there are unacceptable human health cancer risks or non-cancer health

hazards associated with the groundwater contamination at the site. Though no private wells exist on the Site property, the future use of groundwater as a drinking water source is consistent with the State use designation of the aquifer and such use would present unacceptable present and future carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic risks at the Site. These calculated risks to human health require EPA to enact remedial measures to reduce the risks associated with the observed contamination and restore the groundwater to beneficial use. EPA believes that Alternatives GW2, GW4 and GW5 would ultimately provide full protection of human health by reducing contaminant concentrations to cleanup objectives. Alternative GW3 would also reduce contaminant concentrations through treatment, would prevent migration of chemicals off-Site via groundwater transport, and, ultimately, restore the aquifer(s) to best use.

- Compliance with ARARs

EPA and the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) have promulgated health-based protective MCLs (40 CFR Part 141, and 10NYCRR, Chapter 1 and Part 5), which are enforceable standards for various drinking water contaminants (chemical specific ARARs). The aquifer at the Site is classified as Class GA (6 NYCRR 701.18), meaning that it is designated as a potable water supply.

Alternative GW1 does not include any active groundwater remediation; contamination in the groundwater would likely attenuate naturally, to some degree, particularly after a soil remedy is implemented. Alternatives GW2, GW4, and GW5 involve the manipulation of Site groundwater conditions to enhance in situ bioremediation of the COCs by the indigenous microbial population, and, thereby, break-down the COCs into non-hazardous compounds. Alternatives GW2, GW4, and GW5, each focus on the most contaminated regions of the bedrock and overburden aquifers (e.g., under and immediately downgradient of the source area) and, as such, would decrease the amount of time needed to achieve cleanup objectives. Following implementation of Alternatives GW2, GW4 or GW5, it is estimated that ARARs would be achieved throughout the Site within ten years after the soil remedy is implemented. Under Alternative GW3, groundwater would be extracted from both the bedrock and the overburden aquifers, treated by a carbon adsorption system, and discharged to Beaverdam Brook. The discharge to Beaverdam Brook would comply with surface water discharge requirements and the disposition of treatment residuals would have to be consistent with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Alternative GW3 would prevent the potential migration of chemicals off Site via

groundwater transport and, as such, ARARs would be met downgradient of the groundwater containment system (e.g., off the site property); ultimately, treatment of the contaminated groundwater would achieve ARARs within the site property and would restore the aquifer(s) to best use.

For Alternatives GW2, GW3, GW4, and GW5, compliance with ARARs would be demonstrated through a long-term groundwater monitoring program.

- Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence

Once the source control remedy is implemented, it is anticipated that all of the groundwater alternatives would achieve groundwater ARARs, although Alternative GW1 would be expected to take the longest. The time to achieve groundwater standards would vary for the other alternatives due to the complex nature of the subsurface environment.

Alternative GW3 would prevent the potential migration of chemicals off Site via groundwater transport, but would take longer to achieve cleanup objectives than Alternatives GW2, GW4, or GW5. As Alternatives GW2, GW4, and GW5 focus on the most contaminated regions of the bedrock and overburden aquifers, these alternatives would be expected to achieve aquifer restoration more quickly than the other alternatives.

- Reduction in Toxicity, Mobility or Volume

Alternatives GW2, GW4, and GW5 would each reduce the volume and toxicity of the contaminants through treatment by chemically breaking down the bulk of the dissolved VOC and SVOC contamination as it migrates through the aquifer. The VOC and SVOC contaminants would be changed into degradation products.

Alternative GW3 would reduce the toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminated groundwater through removal and treatment with the goal of restoring the aquifers to their beneficial uses.

GW1 provides no further reduction in toxicity, mobility or volume of contaminants of any media through treatment. Following implementation of the source area remedy, natural attenuation processes would likely occur to some degree even under this alternative. Future risks posed by the site will depend on future site usage.

- Short-Term Effectiveness

Alternative GW1 presents virtually no change to the short-term impacts to human health and the environment since no construction or active remediation is involved. Alternatives GW2, GW3, GW4, and GW5 each present some risk to on-property workers through dermal contact and inhalation from activities associated with groundwater remediation. Specifically, construction and remedial activities required to implement Alternatives GW2, GW4, and GW5 would potentially pose a risk of worker exposure to the oxygenating compound(s) when injected into the aquifer. The possibility of having to readminister oxygenating compound(s) in future injections is likely. Alternative GW3 would potentially result in greater short-term exposure to contaminants to workers who install extraction wells and the groundwater tile collection system, as well as come into contact with the treatment system. In addition, under Alternatives GW2, GW3, GW4, and GW5, some adverse impacts would result from disruption of traffic, excavation activities, noise, and fugitive dust emissions. However, proper health and safety precautions would minimize short-term exposure risks as well as disturbances.

- Implementability

Alternative GW1 would be the easiest groundwater alternative to implement, since it would require no activities. Alternative GW3 would be the most difficult alternative to implement in that it would require the construction of a groundwater extraction system including piping and a tile water collection system. Alternative GW2 would be easier to implement than Alternatives GW4 and GW5. The services and materials necessary for each of the groundwater alternatives are readily available. Under Alternatives GW2, GW3, GW4, and GW5, groundwater sampling would be necessary to monitor treatment effectiveness. Each of the alternatives have been proven effective for most, if not all, of the COCs in groundwater.

- Cost

The estimated capital, annual operation and maintenance (O&M) (including monitoring), and present-worth costs for each of the soil remediation alternatives are presented in Table 3. All costs are presented in U.S. Dollars.

Table 3: Cost Comparison for Groundwater Remediation Alternatives

Remedial Alternative	Capital Cost	Annual Cost	Present Worth	Duration of Operation
GW1	0	950	15,000	N/A
GW2	13,200	106,700	528,000	8 years
GW3	1,656,000	229,000	3,339,000	13 years
GW4	332,000	106,700	846,000	8 years
GW5	191,000	106,700	738,000	8 years

According to the capital cost, O&M cost and present worth cost estimates, Alternative GW1 has the lowest cost and GW3 has the highest cost when comparing all alternatives.

- State Acceptance

NYSDEC concurs with the preferred remedy.

- Community Acceptance

Community acceptance of the preferred remedy will be assessed in the ROD following review of the public comments received on the Post Decision Proposed Plan.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES

Based upon an evaluation of the various alternatives, EPA recommends employing Alternative S4 (Excavation and On-Site SVE and Biocell) to remediate the source area and Alternative GW2 (Enhanced Bioremediation with Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring) to remediate the groundwater. Implementation of these alternatives would include institutional controls to restrict groundwater use and prevent disturbance of the soils in the biocell until groundwater ARARs and/or soil cleanup objectives are met.

Specifically, an environmental easement/restrictive covenant would be filed in the property records of Orange County. The easement/covenant would, at a minimum, require: (a) restricting any excavation below the soil surface layer in the area of the biocell, unless the excavation activities are in compliance with an EPA-approved site management plan; (b) restricting new construction at the Site unless an evaluation of the potential for vapor intrusion is conducted and mitigation, if necessary, is performed in compliance with an EPA approved site management plan; (c) restricting the use of groundwater as a source of potable or process water unless groundwater quality standards are met; and (d)

the owner/operator to complete and submit periodic certifications that the institutional and engineering controls are in place.

A Site Management Plan (SMP) would be developed to address soils and groundwater at the Site. The SMP would provide for the proper management of all Site remedy components post-construction, such as institutional controls, and shall also include: (a) monitoring of Site groundwater to ensure that, following the soil excavation, the contamination is attenuating and groundwater quality continues to improve; (b) identification of any use restrictions on the Site; (c) necessary provisions for implementation of the requirements of the above easement/covenant; and (d) provision for any operation and maintenance required of the components of the remedy.

Upon completion of remediation, no hazardous substances would remain above levels that would prevent unlimited use or unrestricted exposure. Under the preferred remedy, EPA would conduct reviews of the site at least once every five years until groundwater remediation has restored the aquifer(s) to drinking water quality standards and soil cleanup objectives are met.


Basis for the Remedy Preference

EPA believes that Alternative S4 is the most cost-effective option for the contaminated soils given the evaluation criteria and reasonably anticipated future land use. While Alternative S4 may involve potential short-term community impacts in the form of nuisances associated with construction (e.g., noise and truck traffic), Alternative S4 would be protective of human health and the environment. Furthermore, Alternative S4 would provide a permanent solution, and would achieve soil cleanup objectives for the site-related COCs in the shortest amount of time and in the most cost-effective manner. Therefore, EPA and NYSDEC believe that Alternative S4 would effectuate the soil cleanup while providing the best balance of tradeoffs with respect to the evaluating criteria.


Alternative S1 was not identified as the preferred alternative because it calls for no action and would not be protective of human health and the environment. Similarly, Alternative 2 would only provide limited action by imposing institutional controls and site fencing and warning maintenance signs. Alternative 3 was not proposed because, while it is slightly less expensive than Alternative 4, it calls for containment of the waste constituents and provides no treatment of the contamination. Alternative 5 was not proposed because, while it includes the soil vapor extraction technology of Alternative 4, it does not include the biological treatment component, which EPA believes will be effective in addressing the pyridine-related compounds. Alternative 6 was not proposed because it would not appear to be cost-effective compared to the other alternatives.

EPA is proposing Alternative GW2 to address the contaminated groundwater because the Agency believes it would be protective of human health and the environment and would achieve the ARARs in the most cost-effective manner. Alternative GW1 would rely solely on natural processes to restore groundwater quality to beneficial use, and, as such, would take significantly longer than the preferred alternative. While Alternative GW3 would prevent the potential migration of chemicals off Site via groundwater transport, it would take longer to achieve cleanup objectives and would cost significantly more than Alternatives GW2, GW4, and GW5. While Alternatives GW2, GW4, and GW5 are similar in that they each involve the addition of oxygen into the groundwater environment to enhance biodegradation of the contaminants, Alternative GW2 would be easier to implement than the other alternatives, and is expected to cost significantly less.

Therefore, EPA and NYSDEC believe that the combination of Alternatives S4 and GW2 would successfully remediate the contaminated soils and expedite the remediation of contaminated groundwater at the Site, while providing the best balance of tradeoffs among the alternatives with respect to the evaluation criteria. Furthermore, the preferred remedies would utilize permanent solutions and treatment technologies to the maximum extent practicable.



SOURCE: USGS MAYBROOK NEW YORK AND GOSHEN NEW YORK QUADRANGLE MAP



SOURCE: RAND McNALLY ROAD ATLAS



figure 1
 SITE LOCATION
 FORMER LAGOON SITE
 Hamptonburgh, New York




figure 2
 SITE PLAN
 FORMER LAGOON SITE
 Hamptonburgh, New York



03898-00(032)GN-WA015 JUN 23/2006


RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

APPENDIX V-a1

New York State Concurrence with
the Selected Remedy in the July 2007 Proposed Plan

**New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation, 12th Floor**

625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-7011
Phone: (518) 402-9706 • FAX: (518) 402-9020
Website: www.dec.ny.gov



Alexander B. Grannis
Commissioner

JUL 26 2007

Mr. George Pavlou
Director, Emergency & Remedial Response Division
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Floor 19
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866

Re: Nepera Maybrook
Site No. 336010
Proposed Remedial Action Plan

Dear Mr. Pavlou:


The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the New York State Department of Health have reviewed the above referenced Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP). The State concurs with the selected remedy as stated in the July 2007 PRAP, and as summarized below

- The soil remedy will consist of the excavation of the soil from the six former wastewater lagoons and the treatment of the contaminated soil with soil vapor extraction (SVE) and biological degradation within an engineered below-grade biocell. If necessary, the air removed from the biocell via the SVE will be treated using carbon adsorption prior to being recirculated or exhausted to the atmosphere. It is expected that this remedy will achieve TAGM 4046 and Part 375 soil cleanup objectives as stated in the PRAP.
- The groundwater remedy will remediate site groundwater conditions through enhanced in-situ bioremediation of the groundwater contaminants by the indigenous microbial population. The excavated lagoon areas will be treated with oxygenating compounds to create an aerobic environment and stimulate biodegradation of groundwater within the areas of elevated contamination.
- The application of the oxygenating compounds will be followed by a long-term groundwater monitoring program to evaluate the rates of biodegradation and contaminant attenuation and will ensure that this remedy is protective of human health and the environment. It is expected that the groundwater remedy will achieve New York State groundwater standards.
- To enhance aerobic biodegradation outside of the source area, the remedial design will consider location-specific injections of oxygenating compounds at various locations in the groundwater contamination plumes.

- The private supply wells in the vicinity of the site, currently being monitored for site related contaminants, will continue to be sampled periodically as deemed necessary by the NYSDOH.
- The remedy will include institutional controls in the form of an environmental easement/restrictive covenant to be filed in the property records of Orange County to restrict any excavation below the soil surface layer in those areas undergoing remediation, restrict new construction at the site, restrict the use of groundwater as a source of potable process water, and require that the owner/operator complete and submit periodic certifications that the institutional and engineering controls are in place.
- A Site Management Plan (SMP) will be developed to provide for the proper management of all post-construction site-remedy components, such as institutional controls and engineering controls (such as the perimeter fence), identification of site use restrictions, enforcement of the requirements of the easement/covenant, operation and maintenance of the remedy components, and implementation the groundwater monitoring program.
- The institutional controls will continue to apply to the site and the SMP will continue to be implemented until such time as both the site soil cleanup objectives and the groundwater standards are met and discontinuation of the ICs and the SMP is approved by all agencies involved with this project.

If you have any questions, please contact Robert Cozzy at 402-9767.

Sincerely,



Dale A. Desnoyers
Director

Division of Environmental Remediation

c: M. MacCabe
M. Dannenberg, USEPA

cc: S. Ervolina
R. Cozzy
J. Aversa
R. Schick
R. Pergadia, Region 3
A. Perretta, NYSDOH
M. Rivara, NYSDOH
S. Bates, NYSDOH
G. Litwin, NYSDOH
J. LaPadula, USEPA
A. Carnenter, USEPA

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

APPENDIX V-b

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING
AUGUST 16, 2007
HAMPTONBURGH TOWN HALL
CAMPBELL HALL, NEW YORK

1 UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

2 STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF ORANGE

3 -----x

4 IN THE MATTER REGARDING NEPERA CHEMICAL COMPANY,
5 INC., SUPERFUND SITE

6 -----x

7

8 PUBLIC MEETING

9 DATE: THURSDAY, AUGUST 16, 2007

10 LOCATION: HAMPTONBURGH TOWN HALL

11 18 Bull Road

12 Campbell Hall, New York

13 TIME: 7:12 p.m.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

22

23

24

25

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 U. S. Environmental Protection

4 Agency

5 Intergovernment & Community
6 Affairs

7 Branch
290 Broadway, 26th Floor
New York, New York 10007

8 CECILIA ECHOLS, Community
9 Involvement

Coordinator

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 JOHN LaPADULA

13 MARK DANNENBERG

14 MICHAEL CYVAK

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Good
3 evening. Thank you all so much for
4 coming out tonight to hear how EPA
5 plans on cleaning up the Nepera
6 Chemical Superfund Site. I'm Cecilia
7 Echols, and I am the Community
8 Involving Coordinator for this site.

9 At this site, there is
10 contaminated soil as well as
11 groundwater, and that's what we're
12 here to express to you all how we plan
13 on cleaning up this site and hearing
14 your comments, and I hope many of you
15 have had an opportunity to review the
16 proposed plan. We also had handouts
17 on the table in the back, the proposed
18 plan as well as the presentation
19 tonight, and the public notice that

20 was placed in the newspaper.

21 As I said, I'm Cecilia Echols,
22 and we have other EPA people here to
23 give the presentation. We have
24 John LaPadula. He's to the left of
25 me. He'll give the Superfund remedial

1 process. Mark Dannenberg, he's
2 project manager. He'll discuss the
3 site background, preferred response
4 action. And then we'll open up for
5 all your questions and answers.

6 Please hold all your questions
7 until after the presentation. You can
8 also, on the presentation handouts,
9 write your little questions, if you'd
10 like, and have them addressed after
11 the presentation.

12 Community Relations is a
13 program that wants the community
14 involved in the decision-making
15 process, which directly affects you
16 where a Superfund Site is. So that is
17 why we come out here for public
18 comment. The public comment period
19 started July 31st, and it ends on

20 August 29th.

21 As I said, please hold your
22 questions to the end. Please state
23 your name loudly as the stenographer
24 requested shortly ago. There is an
25 information repository. There is one

1 here. There is also one in Manhattan.
2 You can also go online. If you look
3 at the proposed plan on the bottom,
4 there is a web page for all documents
5 related to this site. You can always
6 go online to review those documents at
7 your leasure.

8 There is also an 800 number.
9 800 number comes into my office. If
10 you have any questions regarding this
11 site, it would be directed to me. The
12 800 number is 1-800-346-5009.

13 Once we receive all of the
14 public comment, we then open -- we go
15 through a process of we come -- I'm
16 sorry. We develop a synopsis of all
17 of the concerns and comments from you
18 all written, or e-mailed, or from
19 tonight; there will be a transcript,

20 and then they -- we compile a Record
21 of Decision, which is signed by the
22 regional administrator. That will be
23 explained a little bit more in John's
24 presentation.

25 I would like to recognize a

1 couple of other people here tonight.
2 We have Anthony Peretta. He's a
3 Project Manager with New York State
4 DOH. Joel Crua? He's a Supervisor in
5 the New York State DOH. Susan Spear,
6 she's with Congressman John Paul's
7 office. Rich Mayfield, County
8 Executive for Ed Diana, and Supervisor
9 Jankowski. Thank you.

10 And now, we will move on to
11 the next agenda item, which is the
12 Superfund Remedial Process.

13 JOHN LaPADULA: Thank you,
14 Cecilia, and thank you all for coming
15 tonight.

16 I'm just going to briefly go
17 over a little bit of the background of
18 Superfund and what the remedial
19 process includes to put tonight's

20 meeting kind of in a perspective.

21 Congress enacted Superfund in

22 1980, as a result of several notorious

23 sites that we became aware of in the

24 late 1970's. The Valley of the Drums

25 in Kentucky was one of them, and the

1 other one was Love Canal, which is a
2 little closer to home.

3 And at that point this was
4 a -- the beginning, I would say, the
5 environmental movement. Rachel
6 Carson, Silent Spring was in the early
7 '60's and through the '60's into the
8 '70's we became aware of lots of
9 sites, lots of properties that were
10 heavily contaminated over
11 manufacturing and disposal or improper
12 disposal that occurred for much of the
13 Twentieth Century.

14 The Superfund law was called
15 Comprehensive Environmental Response
16 Compensation Liability Act. It was
17 passed and enacted in 1980, and it was
18 amended in 1986 with a series of
19 amendments.

20 The law basically provides
21 money for the Federal Government to
22 spend on the clean up of hazardous
23 waste sites. Most of them are what we
24 would describe as uncontrolled
25 hazardous waste sites, and they could

1 present immediate problems, or they
2 could present long-term problems. It
3 also -- the law also gave the EPA the
4 authority to have companies that are
5 deemed responsible for contributing to
6 the contamination of the sites the
7 authority to get the companies to
8 actually do the work.

9 So the concept was that for
10 sites, where there were no companies
11 that could be identified, the Federal
12 Government would provide the funding
13 to conduct the investigation and the
14 clean-ups. For other sites, we were
15 able to identify the potentially
16 responsible parties, it would allow us
17 to give us the authorization to enter
18 into legal contracts with them, so
19 that they could do the studies and

20 conduct the clean-ups. And, for those

21 sites, EPA has an oversight role.

22 The State of New York also has

23 an oversight role. The -- I'm sorry.

24 Go back. I was going to go back to

25 the site discovery.

1 This is a list of the
2 different component sites we'll
3 actually go through. Once we become
4 aware of a site, it could be from
5 State, it could be from the county or
6 local government, also from private
7 citizens, if they're aware of property
8 that might have some contamination, we
9 would be notified, and we go through a
10 site discovery and ranking process.

11 It's actually a formal process.

12 We collect data and analyze
13 the data; putting to a process that's
14 been laid out by Congress, and we rank
15 the site, and the sites that are on
16 the Superfund list, that's the Federal
17 list, were the sites that were ranked.
18 All of these sites were ranked across
19 the country. New York has about 110

20 of them originally. Many of them are
21 deleted now. These are the Federal
22 sites.

23 Once the site is placed on the
24 National Priority's List, we can spend
25 money to start an investigation to

1 characterize the extent of
2 contamination at the properties. The
3 study is called Remedial
4 Investigation, and it involves a plan
5 to sample soil waste material,
6 groundwater wetlands, or surface
7 waters, if they're adjacent to the
8 site; sediments in the wetlands in the
9 surface waters in the site. On a lake
10 it could be the lake bottoms as well.

11 All of that data is then
12 reviewed and analyzed to see if, in
13 fact, the site does present a risk to
14 public health and the environment.
15 Many of the sites do, and after we
16 have made that determination then we
17 identify through the feasibility site
18 process different alternatives that
19 would address the contamination.

20 For example, if the soil were
21 contaminated, there might be different
22 types of approaches you could take to
23 clean the soil or remediate the soil.
24 You might incinerate it. You might
25 try to detoxify it. You might dig it

1 up and take it away. There's
2 different types of options.

3 Similarly for the groundwater
4 there will be different approaches as
5 to how the groundwater could be
6 cleaned. So remedial investigation
7 and the feasibility study are what
8 we're going to present to you this
9 evening; the finding of both of those
10 efforts.

11 We have prepared a proposed
12 plan, and that's a summary of the two
13 studies and the alternatives that were
14 looked at, and it also identifies what
15 we in the State believe is the
16 preferred alternative to address the
17 contaminated media at the site. We
18 will -- Mark will, you know, describe
19 all the alternatives and explain, you

20 know, what we decided to propose.

21 We're most interested in your
22 comments on what the proposal is. We
23 will, as Cecilia said, we will
24 consider all the comments here, that
25 are submitted in writing, that are

1 submitted by e-mail, and respond to
2 all the comments, and then based on
3 public comment, will decide whether or
4 not to proceed and sign a Record of
5 Decision. That's the next step that
6 we would authorize the clean up of the
7 site.

8 So for this evening, much of
9 the talk will be from Mark, and he
10 will describe the study that has been
11 done.

12 EPA did not and the State did
13 not do the study themselves. As Mark
14 will explain, how the study was done
15 essentially by the responsible
16 parties. EPA and the State were to
17 all to -- to direct and oversee that
18 the work was being done according to
19 the processes and protocols that we

20 would normally use.

21 Once the Record of Decision is
22 signed, after we received the comments
23 at the end of the public comment
24 period, the next phases of the
25 Superfund process, which are the next

1 two major phases, would be designing
2 the remedies, which is a detailed
3 engineering design with blue prints,
4 and plans, and specs signed and sealed
5 by engineers of the State of New York,
6 and the last phase is actually the
7 implementation of the construction
8 phase, where the remedy would be
9 constructed, and earth would move, and
10 wells might be put in for groundwater
11 treatment, and that type of thing.

12 Once the site construction
13 activities are done, there may be a
14 period of time, depending on the site
15 and what's being remediated, that the
16 treatment systems may have to operate.
17 Sometimes groundwater treatment
18 systems can operate for five years,
19 ten years, until the groundwater is

20 restored to drinking water standards.
21 Sometimes soil remedies would take
22 also several years until the
23 contaminants are removed or reduced in
24 soil.
25 So the construction is really

1 the physical construction of getting
2 the remedy set up for it's continued,
3 let's say, removal of the contaminants
4 or detoxification of the groundwater
5 or for the soil.

6 That's all I wanted really to
7 say, and then to turn it over to Mark,
8 who will go through the work that EPA,
9 and the State, and the responsible
10 parties have been doing for the last
11 number of years.

12 MARK DANNENBERG: Thank you,
13 John.

14 Thank you all for coming too
15 and showing your interest in this
16 site.

17 The proposed remedial copies
18 were mailed out to probably most of
19 you. There are additional copies

20 here.

21 In short, the proposed
22 remedial action was constructed for
23 remedial alternatives to be considered
24 for clean up of soils and groundwater
25 at the site. It also identifies

1 aquifer remedies and all rational
2 plans.

3 The proposed remedial action
4 plan also solicits public comment on
5 all alternatives evaluated, expressed
6 concerns of the community to be
7 considered, also express comment
8 period, and, as indicated earlier, the
9 EPA will take into consideration all
10 public comments.

11 Also, as John indicated
12 before, the Record of Decision is our
13 final decision document for the site,
14 and it will include these responses to
15 public comments.

16 This is a fairly large
17 depiction of the general area of the
18 site. It's a regional water level
19 location map. Right here is the site

20 (indicating); this dark area right
21 here, and you can see there is
22 waterway, Beaver Dam Brook, wraps
23 around on the left side of the site
24 and down here to Otterkill.
25 GERTRUDE HODGES: How do we

1 know exactly where it is without
2 having any road designations or
3 whatever?

4 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, I'll
5 have another illustration.

6 GERTRUDE HODGES: But what do
7 you mean?

8 MARK DANNENBERG: Do you know
9 were Highway 4 is?

10 GERTRUDE HODGES: No.

11 MARK DANNENBERG: County 4 is?
12 How County 4 -- you don't know? Okay.

13 You know where Maybrook Road is?

14 GERTRUDE HODGES: Uh-huh.

15 MARK DANNENBERG: Maybrook
16 Road is County Highway 4.

17 GERTRUDE HODGES: Were is it
18 on the map?

19 MARK DANNENBERG: It fronts

20 the property on the site, on the north

21 side.

22 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Your name,

23 ma'am?

24 GERTRUDE HODGES: My name is

25 Gertrude Hodges. And the property I'm

1 concerned about is 41 Jones Lane off
2 of Neelytown Road.

3 MARK DANNENBERG: I want to
4 start just a little bit of the history
5 of the site. From 1953 to 1967 the
6 site was used by the Nepera Chemical
7 Company. They trucked waste water
8 from their facility in Harriman to
9 this site. It was discharged in the
10 lagoons constructed in the Earth. So
11 there were six lagoons constructed in
12 all.

13 GERTRUDE HODGES: What does
14 that mean?

15 CECILIA ECHOLS: Could you
16 hold your questions until the end?

17 GERTRUDE HODGES: He's not
18 explaining it clear enough for me to
19 follow along with him. What's he

20 talking about a ravine? Was it a

21 pond --

22 MARK DANNENBERG: A lagoon is

23 somewhat like a pond, waste water is

24 placed in there.

25 GERTRUDE HODGES: Holding

1 place?

2 MARK DANNENBERG: Yeah.

3 GERTRUDE HODGES: I'm sorry.

4 MARK DANNENBERG: All right.

5 This is a little bit clearer

6 (indicating). Right here is Maybrook

7 Road, County Highway 4. This is an

8 access road coming in. Here are the

9 six constructed lagoons on the site.

10 The site is about 29 acres in

11 size. Out of the 29 acres, these

12 lagoons comprised up four and a half

13 acres of the site. To the west side,

14 I've indicated this on a bigger map.

15 You can see a little better here

16 (indicating). This is Beaver Dam

17 Brook; has a little pond here, and all

18 of this drains into Otterkill on the

19 south side of the site. There are

20 three residences right nearby. There
21 is one right here. There is another
22 one right across from the access road
23 in the site. This again is the access
24 road and there is another one down
25 here on the far side of the pond.

1 The U.S. EPA placed this site
2 on the National Priorities List in
3 1986. DEC was the primary lead at
4 that point. It went into an agreement
5 with the responsible party here,
6 Nepera Chemical Company, Inc., to
7 conduct and review an investigation
8 and a feasibility study. Nepera
9 Chemical Company shortly afterward
10 contracted with a consultant to do the
11 actual work, the actual investigation.

12 I just want to add to that.
13 Over the last few years, the EPA
14 really has been the primary oversight
15 lead on the site, and DEC is also the
16 oversight.

17 Okay. The remedial
18 investigation was conducted in several
19 phases. First phase was done from

20 1988 to 1992. A lot of soil samples
21 were taken from the lagoon area to
22 identify contamination. Groundwater
23 monitoring wells were installed at the
24 site, and groundwater monitoring
25 program began. There are -- note

1 also, actually, I say, over here
2 groundwater monitoring wells were
3 installed in both the overburden
4 aquifer and the bedrock aquifer.
5 There are two groundwater bodies at
6 this site. The overburden which is --
7 it's much more of a superficial. It's
8 a water table aquifer, and underlining
9 that is the bedrock. The bedrock also
10 contains an aquifer, and they're
11 interconnected.

12 The next phase of the remedial
13 investigation report was conducted in
14 1995, '96, and '97. A lot more soil
15 samples were collected from the
16 lagoons to better identify the
17 contaminants of the site. The
18 groundwater monitoring was continued
19 again to ensure that groundwater was

20 not migrating from the site.

21 And in the third phase,

22 additional monitoring was installed in

23 2001 to ascertain the extent of the

24 contaminates. Again, there was

25 concern as to whether the

1 contamination was spreading. So we
2 had the responsible party install
3 additional wells. Groundwater
4 monitoring continued. It was
5 installed in 2001, 2002 during this
6 phase, and we also went out and
7 collected 120 additional soil samples
8 that were analyzed for inorganics;
9 metals in particular. This was
10 directed specifically to determine
11 whether or not there was no
12 contamination on the site.

13 After the -- after collecting
14 all this data -- we have hundreds of
15 points of data from soil sampling as
16 well as groundwater sampling -- we
17 evaluated the data, looked at it,
18 determined the following contaminants
19 were present in on-site subsurface

20 soils as well as the ground; the
21 contaminants, specifically toluene,
22 xylene, benzene, chlorobenzene,
23 ethylbenzene and pyridine compounds.
24 There were a couple of different
25 compounds found. The test involved

1 soil and groundwater.

2 Other findings from the
3 remedial investigation were the
4 organics were found at elevated levels
5 in subsurface soils throughout the
6 whole lagoon area. They were also
7 found in elevated levels in both
8 aquifers. From all of the samples we
9 took, in particular with the extra
10 amount of sampling we did, we
11 determined that there were no elevated
12 levels of inorganics at the site.
13 They were analogous; similar to
14 background samples from locations
15 uncontaminated by the lagoons, and,
16 therefore, metals and inorganics are
17 not contaminants or a concern at the
18 site.

19 Furthermore, it was determined

20 also that the former lagoons are not
21 only contaminated, but they are acting
22 as a source of groundwater
23 contamination, and based on these
24 results the remedial investigation --
25 of the remedial investigation, based

1 on risk assessment, was conducted to
2 actually estimate the risks.

3 To summarize the risks, EPA
4 bases its remedial action on
5 minimizing threats to human health and
6 the environment. This is fairly
7 typical, and since the main concern
8 for soil contamination stems really
9 from health risks, both from direct
10 contact to contaminated soil and from
11 secondary contamination of water
12 supplies, this is, you know, a primary
13 concern.

14 We determined there are no
15 current unacceptable risks to human
16 health, current. Site related
17 contaminants have been found in
18 groundwater above drinking water
19 standards. Now, here too, I'd like to

20 point out, these are above drinking
21 water standards. There is some
22 groundwater on the site. There are no
23 drinking water wells located on the
24 site, but the concentrations of
25 contaminants in the drinking water are

1 higher than drinking water standards.

2 There are -- there's a
3 potential for unacceptable risk to
4 human health for future uses; such as,
5 if a drinking water well was installed
6 at the site, that would be a risk.

7 And there is potential that additional
8 drinking waters could be impacted, if
9 the groundwater contamination was
10 spread.

11 Okay. Remedial action
12 objectives; these are goals to protect
13 human health and the environment.

14 These objectives were based on
15 available information and on
16 standards. Specific remedial action
17 objectives for the site are to prevent
18 exposure to contaminated soils, to
19 minimize migration of contaminate in

20 soils to groundwater, and to ensure
21 that contaminants are cleaned up to
22 acceptable levels.

23 For groundwater, the objective
24 would be to restore the groundwater to
25 beneficial use, which is drinking

1 water quality. This is because New
2 York State has designated groundwater
3 in the area as sources of drinking
4 water and to prevent further migration
5 of contaminated groundwater.

6 The next step in the process
7 is the feasibility study. John talked
8 about this a little bit earlier. It
9 was conducted to determine what
10 remedial actions may be appropriate at
11 the site, and then to evaluate these
12 options, and determine what actually
13 would be the best choice.

14 Through this process, it began
15 really with many alternatives, many
16 possible alternatives. There
17 alternatives were screen through, to
18 really hone down the list to a focused
19 list. This focused list is reported

20 in the feasibility study report as
21 well as in the proposed plan. It
22 presents six remedial alternatives for
23 contaminated groundwater and five
24 remedial alternatives for contaminated
25 groundwater -- it's six for soil, five

1 for groundwater. I'm sorry.

2 These are the specific
3 alternatives for soil. The first
4 alternative is no action. Actually
5 I'll list these up front, and I'll be
6 describing each of these alternatives
7 more specifically in the following
8 slides.

9 The second alternative is
10 institutional controls with limited
11 physical controls.

12 Third is installation of a cap
13 over the contaminated area.

14 Fourth is excavation of
15 contaminated soil and placement of
16 that soil into an on-site biocell and
17 soil vapor extraction system.

18 The fifth alternative is
19 in-situ soil vapor extraction, and the

20 final alternative, number six, is
21 excavation of all contaminated soil
22 and remove it for off-site disposal.

23 The first remedial action is
24 literally no action. This is required
25 actually under law so that we have a

1 baseline to compare all the other
2 alternatives to. Takes no action, and
3 the contaminants would remain on site.

4 The second alternative,
5 institution of controls, are
6 mechanisms that can be instituted to
7 control the use of the property. An
8 example might be to ban the
9 installation of drinking water wells.

10 So here institutional controls, such
11 as deed restrictions or environmental
12 easements, would be considered;
13 physical controls such as restricting
14 site access, and maintaining the
15 perimeter fence at the site. Again,
16 contaminants can remain on the site
17 for this alternative.

18 The third alternative is to
19 place a cap over all the contaminated

20 soil. This would both prevent people
21 from contact with the contaminated
22 soil underneath the cap, and it would
23 eliminate the possibility of
24 precipitation really going through
25 that contaminated soil, and

1 percolating down, and dragging the
2 contaminants with it into the
3 groundwater. On top I say:
4 Installation of a cap landfill cover.
5 It's not a landfill at the site, but
6 it is a landfill-type cover. It would
7 be a cap.

8 The fourth alternative is
9 excavation of all contaminated soil.
10 Placement of that contaminated soil
11 into a lined cell, called biocell, and
12 placement of a soil vapor extraction
13 system also within the cell. So
14 really would have -- would give dual
15 system. It would have two
16 technologies built into the system.
17 One would be biocell. The other would
18 be soil vapor extraction. Soil vapor
19 extraction is a technology. It's used

20 to reduce concentrations of violative
21 organics. All of the -- well, five
22 out of the six contaminants that I
23 listed earlier are violative organics.
24 The other one, pyridine compounds, is
25 a semi-volatile, and that can also be

1 influenced by the soil vapor
2 extraction unit. And the soil vapor
3 extraction unit basically what you do
4 is you hook up a couple of wells, and
5 you hook up a vacuum, literally a
6 vacuum, and you suck the vapor out of
7 the back, and then you pull the
8 contaminants out.

9 The fifth alternative is
10 in-situ soil vapor extraction. Soil
11 vapor extraction system here would
12 operate much the same as it would in
13 the fourth alternative. The
14 difference is that term, "in-situ,"
15 which basically means it would be
16 below the ground in the natural
17 environment. Installed in the
18 property as it is -- extracted vapors.
19 I'm sorry. If you could bring back

20 that for a second.

21 Extracted vapors would be

22 treated, if necessary, use of carbon

23 prior to discharge. Basically the

24 carbon you would pass the vapors

25 through a granulated carbon unit. The

1 contaminants would absorb on top
2 through granulated carbon, and there
3 would be a solid phase. You would
4 still have to dispose of, at that
5 point, the carbon contaminants. It
6 would be a much smaller quantity. The
7 air passing through would be cleaned.

8 Okay. The sixth alternative
9 would be excavation and off-site
10 disposal. This would involve
11 excavating all contaminated soil on a
12 site and taking it to a licensed
13 landfill, a licensed facility. The --
14 after the excavation is done, post
15 excavation confirmatory sampling
16 program would be instituted, and this
17 would just be really enacted to make
18 sure that things were being done
19 right. The post excavation sampling

20 would be done just to make sure you're

21 on clean soil.

22 The alternatives for

23 groundwater are again no action,

24 enhanced bioremediation, long-term

25 groundwater monitoring; ground water

1 extraction and treatment; enhanced
2 bioremediation; biosparging. Now,
3 here with the exception of the no
4 action alternative, all of the other
5 alternatives I only indicated here on
6 the groundwater alternative two, but
7 all of them would necessitate or
8 involve some type of long-term
9 monitoring program.

10 Okay. This same picture I
11 showed earlier, but superimposed on it
12 is kind of a curved line over here, a
13 purple line. I don't know if you can
14 make that out that it's purple from
15 back here, but this basically
16 indicates all our groundwater
17 contamination. It's still contained
18 on site, but this would be a
19 groundwater we would be concerned

20 with.

21 Again, a no action alternative

22 is required as a baseline just to

23 compare our alternatives to. No

24 groundwater would actually be treated

25 in any way.

1 For alternative two is enhanced
2 bioremediation. It involves
3 manipulating the site groundwater
4 conditions to enhance bioremediation.
5 Oxygen and nutrients would be put into
6 the groundwater to basically help the
7 microbes for bacteria that are there
8 to biodegrade the contaminants.

9 The third alternative we refer
10 to pretty much a pump and treat. You
11 would extract the water, you would
12 pump the water out from the ground
13 water, and you would treat it, and
14 here would be extracted water from
15 both aquifers, the overburden and the
16 bedrock, and here too the groundwater
17 would be treated using carbon
18 absorption system. It's the same
19 thing I explained before with the

20 carbon and you have a solid waste to
21 dispose of. The -- I'm sorry go
22 ahead.

23 The fourth alternative also
24 involves manipulating site groundwater
25 conditions to enhanced bioremediation

1 of contaminants. An oxygenated
2 compound would be injected into the
3 groundwater at multiple points to
4 induce biodegradation.

5 And the fifth and final
6 groundwater alternative is
7 biosparging. Which, like two of these
8 other alternatives, would manipulate
9 the site groundwater conditions. The
10 difference really is how the -- how
11 the conditions are being manipulated.

12 In this alternative, oxygen gas would
13 be injected in very slow flow rates,
14 very low flow rates, into the
15 groundwater. The others would be a
16 little more of a quicker injection.

17 Okay. We again collected
18 hundreds and hundreds of samples. We
19 evaluated it. We looked at our

20 alternatives on our focus list, and we
21 compared those alternatives to these
22 criteria. These criteria, basically
23 the first one, "Overall Protection of
24 Human Health and the Environment,"
25 answers: Does the remedy provide

1 adequate protection, and are risks
2 eliminated and reduced in the long
3 term.

4 The second, "Compliance with
5 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate
6 Requirements" that are applicable or
7 relevant and appropriate requirements
8 are basically standards. So the clean
9 up standards for soil and for
10 groundwater and this basically
11 answers: Does the remedy achieve all
12 clean up standards.

13 The next bullet, "Long-term
14 Effectiveness and Permanence," does
15 the remedy maintain reliable
16 protection of human health over time
17 even after the remedy is implemented.
18 Is human health -- are there any risks
19 to human health.

20 The fourth bullet, "Reduction
21 of Toxicity, Mobility and Volume," is
22 basically straight forward, and it
23 basically asks or it answers: Does
24 the remedy reduce the toxicity of the
25 contaminants; does it reduce actually

1 the volume of the contaminants at the
2 site, whether it be in groundwater or
3 in soil.

4 The next bullet, "Short-term
5 Effectiveness," basically answers: Is
6 this protective in the short term; all
7 the remedies being implemented or
8 precautions taken, and is human health
9 at risks at all, or are there other --
10 other concerns too. I mean, could it
11 be, you know, in the short term; could
12 be a whole bunch of -- if you did an
13 excavation and removal to an off-site
14 landfill, you'd have a whole bunch of
15 trucks moving in on this road that
16 leads into it. That would be an
17 impact. It wouldn't necessarily
18 jeopardize human health, but it would
19 affect and impacted the community.

20 The next bullet,
21 "Implementability," basically answers:
22 Is the measure technically feasible;
23 are there problems securing certain
24 equipment; is it very difficult to
25 perform certain of the -- it might be

1 difficult in a certain area. It might
2 be difficult to access that area
3 getting trucks in with equipment.

4 The next one, "Cost," is
5 pretty straight forward. That's
6 literally the cost of each
7 alternative.

8 Then we have "State
9 Acceptance." Does the State concur or
10 disagree with the preferred remedy,
11 and finally "Community Acceptance,"
12 refers to the public's general
13 response to the alternatives, and this
14 criteria will also be assessed in the
15 Record of Decision.

16 So after evaluating all the
17 data, and after evaluating all of the
18 alternatives through that list of
19 criteria I just went over, the EPA

20 with the State's concurrence recommend
21 appointing a combination of two of the
22 alternatives that I listed. We
23 recommend both soil remedy. It's a
24 remedy of soil contamination as well
25 as a groundwater, and specifically

1 these two alternatives that we
2 recommend are the excavation of all
3 contaminated on-site soil, placement
4 in the biocell, and use of a soil
5 vapor extraction system within that
6 biocell, and groundwater alternative
7 two, which is enhanced by a
8 remediation followed by long-term
9 groundwater monitoring program to make
10 sure the remedy is effective. This
11 combination of alternatives would
12 remove and treat contaminated soils
13 and contaminated groundwater, and we
14 believe it's the best of the remedies,
15 and we believe it is important to
16 combine two alternatives.

17 I just listed the costs of the
18 selected remedial alternatives here
19 for your perspective. But alternative

20 S4, which is biocell soil vapor
21 extraction, this would cost
22 \$3,119,000. For the groundwater
23 alternative it would be a little over
24 a half a million dollars, \$528,000,
25 for a total combined remedy cost of

1 \$3.6 million to remedy the site.

2 CECILIA ECHOLS: Before we
3 open up for questions, I forgot to
4 mention that Michael Cyvak, he is the
5 Risk Assessor for the site, and we
6 also have Richard P. McCormack, the
7 Legislative Aide with Anthony G.
8 Ravid, and Michael McCane with the New
9 York State DEC.

10 So we'll start with questions
11 from -- since there are many people,
12 we'll start from this side, and go to
13 the other side, and go back and forth.

14 Please state your name as clear as
15 possible, and if you would like to
16 indicate your address you're
17 representing, that would also help.
18 Sir.

19 MILES AXTON: Miles Axton, I'm

20 representing the Tomahawk Lake
21 Association. How sure are you that
22 the assessment of the contaminants has
23 been fully investigated? You
24 mentioned that the original
25 designation of the site was based on

1 assessment contracted by the concerned
2 company, the Nepera Company. Has the
3 range of possible contaminants
4 investigated by EPA or New York DEC
5 confirmed the range of contaminants
6 that made the site initially labeled
7 as a Superfund Site?

8 MARK DANNENBERG: Yes.
9 Initially, actually, it wasn't really
10 Nepera Chemical Company that came
11 forward and said; Oh, we have a
12 contamination issue. New York State
13 DEC years earlier went out to the
14 site, had noted that at least one of
15 the fields was leaking into the
16 groundwater; contaminants were going
17 down into the groundwater. This site
18 has been investigated for years. So
19 you have several of these soil

20 sampling results showing the same
21 thing. Like I said, we had hundreds
22 of samples from these people, and
23 yeah, I think it's accurately
24 depicted. We've been able to rule out
25 by collecting to rule out other

1 directives, and complaints, and get
2 down to this list.

3 CECILIA ECHOLS: Name, please?

4 JOY DECKER: Joy Decker,
5 "D-E-C-K-E-R, Route 207 Campbell Hall.
6 I've been in contact with Mr. McCane
7 over the years. I've been in contact
8 with EPA over the years. I've been
9 fighting the site for 13 years now,
10 since I became aware of it.

11 After reviewing your remedial
12 plan, I have to say, personally, I
13 cannot worry about the cost
14 effectiveness about it. I have to
15 worry about the future effectiveness
16 of it, and my understanding is that
17 under your proposed S4, you can't
18 guarantee the air quality under that
19 proposal. You're going to determine

20 whether or not it's necessary to treat
21 the air once you start that remedy,
22 but S6, even though it cost the most,
23 it's a hundred percent guaranteed, but
24 that ground, that soil is moved out of
25 here and brought some where else, and

1 that it's a hundred percent clean, and
2 it ensures the future of the site for
3 me, and for my kids, and for my
4 grandchildren.

5 I also feel that the
6 groundwater proposal -- once again
7 you're looking at the cost
8 effectiveness of it, and in my opinion
9 the GW3 proposal will guarantee the
10 integrity of the aquifers. But the
11 one you're proposing does not
12 guarantee that. It does not guarantee
13 the contaminants in the future will
14 not move somewhere off site. I want a
15 hundred percent guarantee that that
16 soil is clean, it's gone.

17 We've lived with it for 40
18 years. I want to be sure that that
19 water is clean, and that any

20 tributaries that it contaminates will
21 not have a future repercussion from
22 it. I cannot worry for the cost. If
23 Nepera is responsible for paying that
24 cost, there's a Superfund to set up to
25 handle that cost. I can't worry about

1 cost. I have to worry about the
2 future.

3 JOHN LaPADULA: I can respond
4 to that. You know, while I know you
5 want the guarantees, we really cannot
6 provide any guarantees to any of the
7 alternatives. That's just the way it
8 is. There are no guarantees. And for
9 the groundwater, all the groundwater
10 remedies are developed to produce the
11 same end result, and that is to
12 restore the groundwater to drinking
13 water quality.

14 Now, it's done by different
15 mechanisms; extraction and treatment,
16 you know, enhancement of the
17 microorganisms that are down there.
18 To begin with, with any of these,
19 there is no guarantee. The pump and

20 treat system can have difficulties.
21 Some of the other technologies could
22 have difficulties as well. But we are
23 required, you know, under the
24 Superfund Act directed by Congress
25 that we do need to consider cost,

1 while there are a total of nine
2 different criteria, cost is one of
3 them, and cost is a balancing
4 criteria. Can you get to basically
5 the same end point and be reasonably
6 concern that you are going to have a
7 safe site. And that's why we
8 recommended what we did.

9 JOY DECKER: Right. And
10 you're asking for public input too,
11 because --

12 JOHN LaPADULA: We are.

13 JOY DECKER: -- the law also
14 says that the public interest will
15 outweigh the cost effectiveness. So
16 what the majority of the public --
17 what is best for the majority of the
18 public will outweigh whatever that
19 cost is, and you deal with that cost,

20 if the public interest outweighs it.

21 Now, your alternatives that
22 are highly costly are also providing
23 more of a guarantee than any of the
24 other alternatives, and, if you look
25 at other cities and towns throughout

1 the country who have used these
2 different methods, the one that costs
3 the most are the most effective, and
4 have been monitored on a long-term
5 basis, and have shown high
6 effectiveness.

7 MARK DANNENBERG: I -- and
8 just to add --

9 JOY DECKER: And who is going
10 to monitor this site? And where are
11 these samples going? And who is
12 handling these samples? And who's
13 putting these reports out? I watched
14 this site for years, and years, and
15 years. I've seen guys going in there
16 with white suits at 2 o'clock in the
17 morning. Who was passing those
18 samples then?

19 MARK DANNENBERG: I don't know

20 about going in at 2 o'clock --

21 JOY DECKER: I can guarantee

22 you --

23 MARK DANNENBERG: -- I have

24 been --

25 JOY DECKER: -- we took photos

1 of it.

2 MARK DANNENBERG: -- I have
3 been to that site in a white suite, in
4 my Tyvak suit, when we did sediment
5 sample --

6 JOY DECKER: In the dark.

7 MARK DANNENBERG: No. I was
8 there in full daylight. It was a hot
9 day in a Tyvak suit. I was pretty
10 uncomfortable. But just to answer
11 your questions, as far as the
12 effectiveness, it's our assertion from
13 our investigation that the groundwater
14 enhanced by our remediation technology
15 would be more effective than the pump
16 and treat. The pump and treat would
17 contain the migration of
18 contamination, but it would take years
19 longer to actually remediate all the

20 groundwater.

21 JOY DECKER: It's been there

22 40 years.

23 MARK DANNENBERG: That's

24 right, and still no private wells have

25 been impacted above any Federal or

1 State --

2 JOY DECKER: And can I say to
3 you personally we've hunted that land,
4 and we've taken deer up there with
5 tumors the size of grapefruit. So
6 your water might not show
7 contaminants, but there's other signs
8 of that contamination affecting
9 things.

10 CECELIA ECHOLS: Sir, in the
11 back there.

12 JOE VOLNER: My name is Joe
13 Volner. I live across the street from
14 the site; okay. I also have some
15 expertise in the liner system, and I
16 fitted them. Now, I looked at your
17 recommendations; okay. If you want to
18 take everything out of there, I would
19 recommend bringing a soil burner in.

20 If not doing this, do a 360 cap over
21 the area, modify the area that drains
22 off, put a 360 cap on it, and then do
23 a pump and treat. You're not getting
24 your infiltration going down; okay.
25 And you're saying about 13 years.

1 Well, you keep up with it. You watch
2 how the groundwater goes.

3 Like I said, I had -- I do
4 have expertise in this area. So I
5 worked with DEC many times, and I
6 think that would work quite fine
7 without disturbing a lot. We don't
8 need the high traffic of hauling
9 everything out of there. That'll only
10 make things worse. So that's my
11 recommendation.

12 JOHN LaPADULA: Well, as far
13 as the traffic, that would really
14 apply to a dig and haul --

15 JOE VOLNER: Right.

16 JOHN LaPADULA: -- taking it
17 out to another landfill. That would
18 be the most expensive of all soil
19 remedies, and it's not out preferred

20 remedy, or recommended remedy. The
21 cap, you're right, would prevent
22 infiltration from coming through. The
23 contaminants would -- any kind of
24 percolating contaminants through to
25 the groundwater would be significantly

1 reduced. I don't think it would
2 necessarily be eliminated, but the
3 contaminated soil would still remain
4 under the cap.

5 JOE VOLNER: But if you pump
6 and treat that and take a lot of that
7 away you dry the section up.

8 JOHN LaPADULA: Through the
9 groundwater, yeah. We would be
10 pumping, and treating, and cleaning
11 the groundwater, and it would take
12 years. This type of remedy would cut
13 the time --

14 JOE VOLNER: It would only
15 take about eight years.

16 MARK DANNENBERG: It would
17 take, you know, a year or so to design
18 --

19 JOE VOLNER: So you're saying

20 eight years to take it all out. Look
21 at all the danger to the roadways and
22 all that; all the accidents.

23 MARK DANNENBERG: I'm not sure
24 I'm following. Eight years to take it
25 all out?

1 JOE VOLNER: That's what I
2 read. Eight years --

3 MARK DANNENBERG: Eight years
4 until the remedy is completed.

5 JOE VOLNER: Right.

6 MARK DANNENBERG: Right. So
7 this basically we'd be designing the
8 remedy, excavating the soil, putting
9 it into the biocell, treating the soil
10 within the groundwater with the dual
11 technology the excavating with the
12 biocell --

13 JOE VOLNER: That's the way
14 you want to do it.

15 MARK DANNENBERG: That's the
16 way we want to do it.

17 JOE VOLNER: Right.

18 MARK DANNENBERG: And treating
19 the groundwater.

20 JOE VOLNER: Right.

21 MARK DANNENBERG: By the time

22 the remedial design and remedial phase

23 is over, we are projecting about eight

24 years until the site is cleaned up.

25 Two clean up objectives, two

1 standards.

2 JOHN LaPADULA: One of the
3 benefits, the advantages of the
4 biocell, is that the contamination
5 would be biodegraded or withdrawn
6 through the vapor system, and that the
7 soil would no longer have contaminant
8 levels about the New York State clean
9 up objectives. If you cap the site,
10 then basically you have a capped site,
11 and you can never build, you know, on
12 top of the cap or do anything with the
13 cap. So --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good.
15 We don't want to build on that anyway.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No one
17 is going to build on that.

18 MARK DANNENBERG: We could
19 be --

20 JOHN LaPADULA: Technically --

21 MARK DANNENBERG: -- putting

22 restrictions on any of these, as far

23 as building in any certain area. We

24 would not be looking at building on

25 top of the biocell either.

1 JOHN LaPADULA: But once the
2 biocell -- once the action in the cell
3 is completed, the soil should meet New
4 York State objectives, clean up
5 objectives, as any of the soil do now,
6 and technically you could build on the
7 site. Perhaps you would not want do,
8 but you could, and you wouldn't need a
9 further restriction. You wouldn't
10 need a long-term cap. It's a more
11 permanent type of remedy. Yes.

12 PATRICIA TANNER: Patricia
13 Tanner. I'm the little house down on
14 the corner, down near the brook; the
15 only one you have on there. All
16 right. Now, you said you were going
17 to release water into -- one of the
18 things that you release into that
19 brook.

20 MARK DANNENBERG: Into Beaver

21 Dam Brook, right.

22 PATRICIA TANNER: All right.

23 That goes into my pond.

24 MARK DANNENBERG: Yes, it

25 would go right through --

1 PATRICIA TANNER: And my well
2 is only 15 feet from my pond --

3 MARK DANNENBERG: Right.

4 PATRICIA TANNER: -- and
5 what's going to happen there?

6 MARK DANNENBERG: Now, your
7 well, we do go out --

8 PATRICIA TANNER: Yeah, they
9 test my water.

10 MARK DANNENBERG: And you're
11 right. That's not our preferred
12 remedy --

13 PATRICIA TANNER: Yeah.

14 MARK DANNENBERG: But that
15 pumping the water up, and treating it,
16 and discharging it, which is obviously
17 favored by some, but that would be
18 discharged into Beaver Dam.

19 PATRICIA TANNER: Is all the

20 chemicals --

21 MARK DANNENBERG: Right.

22 PATRICIA TANNER: -- listed

23 there?

24 MARK DANNENBERG: No, I have

25 referred -- I don't know if you

1 recall, I've referred to that as
2 Tanner's pond.

3 PATRICIA TANNER: Yeah,
4 well --

5 MARK DANNENBERG: So because I
6 know your house is on it.

7 PATRICIA TANNER: They -- what
8 do you call -- all those chemical are
9 in our water, but they are in a
10 minute --

11 MARK DANNENBERG: Yes.

12 PATRICIA TANNER: -- degree.
13 They are there. We don't drink it;
14 not for drinking water.

15 MARK DANNENBERG: I haven't
16 seen data showing the purity compounds
17 in the --

18 PATRICIA TANNER: I've got a
19 stack of letters referring that high

20 (indicating) Canada, and now they're

21 coming out of --

22 MARK DANNENBERG: New York

23 State DOH; right.

24 PATRICIA TANNER: And what do

25 you call it -- if you're going to burn

1 it, what am I going to have?

2 MARK DANNENBERG: We're not
3 recommending burning it. I'm sorry.

4 This is Joe Crua from the State Health
5 Department.

6 JOE CRUA: What address is
7 that?

8 PATRICIA TANNER: 26 Brie
9 Lane.

10 MICHAEL CYVAK: One thing that
11 everyone should know is when we do
12 this remedial design phase that we
13 talked about in one of the earlier
14 slides, that once we select our
15 remedy, and we decide how we're going
16 to implement that remedy, part of that
17 process will involve coming up with
18 what we call sort of a community
19 safety plan, so that we make sure

20 anything that we design doesn't spread
21 contamination anywhere else. I mean,
22 that certainly is not our goal.

23 When we talk -- when we've
24 been hearing some comments we've been
25 talking about: What happens if when

1 we implement this remedy if
2 contamination is disbursed somehow,
3 and as part of digging it up, or
4 pumping it out, or creating a biocell
5 and venting, or something like that,
6 clearly that is not our objective to
7 take a contamination from where it is
8 and spread it somewhere else. So part
9 of our remedial design, we're going to
10 ensure that we build in the safeguard
11 to allow us to make sure that doesn't
12 happen.

13 PATRICIA TANNER: They have a
14 well right on the edge of the --

15 MICHAEL CYVAK: Okay.

16 PATRICIA TANNER: -- and they
17 put it there, because they found --
18 finding chemicals at the edge of the
19 brook --

20 MICHAEL CYVAK: Okay.

21 PATRICIA TANNER: -- at the

22 head of my pond --

23 MICHAEL CYVAK: Okay.

24 PATRICIA TANNER: -- and they

25 have one there, and they have one on

1 the other side of the pond in the
2 back, and it's monitored though?

3 MICHAEL CYVAK: Absolutely we
4 monitor those.

5 JOE CRUA: Your well was
6 sampled in June, June 14th?

7 PATRICIA TANNER: Right.

8 JOE CRUA: Right. This
9 indicates that nothing was detected in
10 the well. I can go over the results
11 with you --

12 ROBERT TANNER: I think you
13 better. We'll bring our papers with
14 us.

15 JOE CRUA: We have a copy of
16 what was sent, and if there is some
17 confusion we'll be glad to discuss it
18 with you --

19 ROBERT TANNER: Okay.

20 JOE CRUA: -- but what we have
21 indicates that nothing was detected.
22 Now, you may be confused as to the way
23 it's presented. It provides a number
24 of less than, and then it gives the
25 number after that. So that indicates

1 essentially that the implementation
2 that was used, which is a very
3 sensitive implementation, nothing was
4 detected at that very low level, which
5 is very well below the public drinking
6 water standards. I think for all of
7 these compounds it's five parts per
8 billion, and they didn't see anything
9 to what amounts to half parts per
10 billion. So what we're seeing --

11 ROBERT TANNER: Parts per
12 billion, I ain't drinking it.

13 JOE CRUA: Well, there is
14 nothing there. It's less than. It's
15 almost not detected.

16 JOHN LaPADULA: I think the
17 point of that is --

18 JOE CRUA: We can certainly --

19 ROBERT TANNER: Five hundred

20 feet in my backyard. I'm not going to
21 drink it. Since 1975 I had haven't
22 drank it.

23 JOE CRUA: If you'd like to
24 discuss the results later, we can do
25 it.

1 GERTRUDE HODGES: I have great
2 concern --

3 CECEILIA ECHOLS: State your
4 name.

5 GERTRUDE HODGES: My name is
6 Gertrude Hodges, and the property at
7 41 Jones Lane, and it extends over
8 to -- Jones Lane, the front side
9 extends over to close to my brook. My
10 concern is that even after you treat
11 those many particles, how am I going
12 to be able to sell that property at
13 the level and then tell people that
14 this is pure? The ground -- the
15 property has been listed for wetland.
16 The water under that is very shallow.
17 I mean, the depth to go down and get
18 water is very shallow. What assurance
19 are you going to give me that whatever

20 treatment you pick the water on my

21 property is going to be okay?

22 Now, I don't mean this small

23 mini parts, because over time, and I'm

24 agreeing with this gentleman, over

25 time that accumulation in the body can

1 cause problems. It may not cause any
2 right now, because you say right now I
3 see no problems, but look -- go back
4 and look at what you told people at
5 Love Canal over the years and look at
6 what happened to it.

7 So I'm staying to you that in
8 order to protect the community and the
9 health of the community you need to
10 take that trash out of here. The
11 repair was down in Harriman, and he
12 has some houses in the fields that
13 people had built on, and they're now
14 coming back and saying: We can't grow
15 anything on this land.

16 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, the
17 Harriman facility is a production
18 facility. They make chemical
19 companies at the facility. It's a

20 completely different -- it's a

21 completely different site.

22 GERTRUDE HODGES: Not if the

23 trash -- it's a different site, but

24 the same thing is going on there --

25 MARK DANNENBERG: No.

1 GERTRUDE HODGES: -- that's
2 going on here.

3 MARK DANNENBERG: No. It's
4 not there. It's a production. It's a
5 production site. They manufacture
6 organic chemicals there. They have
7 concentrated chemicals and compounds
8 that they use in their process --

9 GERTRUDE HODGES: So what
10 you're saying, what they dumped up
11 here --

12 MARK DANNENBERG: What they
13 dumped up here was waste water. It
14 was waste water from that facility --

15 GERTRUDE HODGES: Byproduct.

16 MARK DANNENBERG: -- but
17 again, it was waste water.

18 ROBERT TANNER: What my
19 property --

20 MARK DANNENBERG: Yeah, a
21 byproduct. Right. But that's not --
22 that's not necessarily the same thing
23 as concentrated chemicals that they're
24 using, baths that they're using, or
25 whatever other constituents they are

1 using to manufacturer the chemicals.

2 It's really a separate -- it's a

3 separate type of --

4 ROBERT TANNER: It's poison.

5 It's poison. It's poison.

6 GERTRUDE HODGES: But you're

7 going to tell me that what they were

8 producing was poison, but the waste

9 water from it is not?

10 JOHN LaPADULA: No, I didn't

11 say that at all. I'm telling you it's

12 a different facility. I'm not telling

13 you it's --

14 GERTRUDE HODGES: I'm not

15 arguing with you that it's the same

16 facility --

17 JOHN LaPADULA: -- I'm saying

18 it's --

19 GERTRUDE HODGES: -- the

20 Nepera Chemical Company, whatever they
21 were doing there, the off shoot of the
22 waste product of it was dumped in our
23 backyard. Those people, who are down
24 in Harriman are now complaining.
25 Those big homes that they built they

1 can't grow anything around it. It's a
2 problem with that now, and now you're
3 going to tell us that we should pick
4 something that is less than, because
5 it would be cost effective.

6 MARK DANNENBERG: No, no. I'm
7 not saying --

8 JOHN LaPADULA: I could also
9 tell you that what we did what we call
10 background sampling, where we took
11 samples outside the lagoon area. We
12 took samples of Beaver Dam Brook --

13 GERTRUDE HODGES: Before you
14 go on --

15 JOHN LaPADULA: -- and the
16 wetlands -- we did -- we did -- no,
17 please don't interrupt me --

18 GERTRUDE HODGES: How did
19 that --

20 JOHN LaPADULA: -- I didn't

21 interrupt --

22 GERTRUDE HODGES: -- how did

23 that --

24 JOHN LaPADULA: I didn't

25 interrupt you. I didn't interrupt

1 you. Please let me finish.

2 We did take samples, many
3 samples in terms of background
4 samples, and we did not detect any of
5 the chemicals we found in the ponds or
6 the lagoons.

7 GERTRUDE HODGES: My question
8 is, how did that get all of that
9 whatever it is get to the lagoon?

10 JOHN LaPADULA: By truck.

11 GERTRUDE HODGES: Huh?

12 JOHN LaPADULA: By truck.

13 GERTRUDE HODGES: Did it cost
14 20 million to take it there?

15 JOHN LaPADULA: I have no
16 idea.

17 GERTRUDE HODGES: However,
18 tell them to truck it back out.

19 JOHN LaPADULA: Comment noted.

20 Yes. Actually, the gentleman behind

21 you. He didn't have a chance yet.

22 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Mr.

23 Dannenberg?

24 MARK DANNENBERG: Yes.

25 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: My name is

1 William Jay Shift. I'm the former
2 Mayor of Village of Maybrook. I'm
3 representing the Village. I'm not
4 representing the Town. I'm
5 representing my family, and the health
6 of my family, and the health of the
7 residents of the Village of Maybrook,
8 and the good people of Hamptonburgh.

9 I had sent you a letter, and
10 may ask why you choose not to respond
11 to it? I did. Copy here. Sent you a
12 letter, and one of the things that I
13 asked in the letter was to please tell
14 me where 255 million gallons of highly
15 toxic waste has gone.

16 In the past 54 years this case
17 has been worked on, and worked on, and
18 reworked on. We've seen the
19 scenarios. We've seen the slide.

20 We've heard the show, and then the
21 presentation, and everything.

22 Disturbing the soil out there,
23 for one thing, how far down are you
24 planning on taking away the soil?

25 MARK DANNENBERG: All the way

1 down to bedrock --

2 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Okay. And
3 then what?

4 MARK DANNENBERG: -- as far as
5 we can dig.

6 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: And then
7 what happens to the 255 million
8 gallons of highly toxic waste? Where
9 has it gone? Where is the plom for
10 all of this?

11 MARK DANNENBERG: I'm not sure
12 we're talking about 255 million --

13 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Well, if
14 you dump -- if you dump 55 gallons a
15 day for fourteen years, I don't have
16 to take my shoes off. It's 255
17 million gallons of toxic fuel.

18 MARK DANNENBERG: These were
19 open lagoons. It was waste water, not

20 toxic fuel.

21 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: It wasn't

22 documented --

23 MARK DANNENBERG: These were

24 open lagoons. They were opened to

25 evaporation.

1 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: If you tell
2 me if barium, cadmium,
3 polychlorinated, PCB's, Cinonide,
4 lead, zinc, arsenic, benzene,
5 polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons,
6 and many other things that are listed
7 in your report are not toxic?

8 MARK DANNENBERG: They have
9 toxicity to them. I would like to
10 know when -- I don't recall seeing a
11 letter from you at all.

12 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: The letter
13 was sent out. And it was sent --

14 MARK DANNENBERG: When it --

15 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: -- and it
16 was sent August the 5th.

17 MARK DANNENBERG: When?

18 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: It was the
19 day immediately after I learned that

20 page 29, way in the back of that
21 record was a one quarter inch summary
22 or story that this Hearing was going
23 to take place. I received no
24 invitation to the hearing. I don't
25 know how many people in this room

1 have.

2 MARK DANNENBERG: So you
3 mailed this out to me on August --

4 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: I mailed it
5 out to you on August 5th.

6 MARK DANNENBERG: Okay. Well,
7 that was 11 days ago.

8 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Yes.

9 MARK DANNENBERG: Okay. I'm
10 sorry I haven't seen it. I've been --

11 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Okay. I'll
12 anxiously await a reply.

13 MARK DANNENBERG: I would
14 be --

15 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: But I would
16 like you --

17 MARK DANNENBERG: I will look
18 for your letter --

19 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: -- to tell

20 me or someone here to tell me that
21 since DEC permit created this
22 situation back in 1953, where these
23 255 million gallons of toxic waste
24 have disseminated?

25 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, water

1 in an open lagoon will evaporate.

2 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Evaporate.

3 MARK DANNENBERG: You're not

4 left off -- you're not left with 255

5 million gallons, because the drums

6 couldn't contain all of that. Okay.

7 The water would evaporate.

8 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: How much is

9 evaporation, and how much of it is --

10 MARK DANNENBERG: Contaminants

11 would be left on.

12 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Pardon me?

13 MARK DANNENBERG: Contaminants

14 would be left on.

15 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Of course.

16 MARK DANNENBERG: Right.

17 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Of course.

18 I don't dispute that.

19 MARK DANNENBERG: This is why

20 we went out and collected the several

21 rounds, hundreds of samples --

22 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Right.

23 MARK DANNENBERG: -- what

24 determined what contaminants were --

25 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: And you

1 found contaminants.

2 MARK DANNENBERG: And we found
3 contaminants, and we want to take care
4 of that. There are enough
5 contaminants there that we want to
6 move forward with the remedial action.

7 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Again, when
8 you reach bedrock, what then?

9 MARK DANNENBERG: At the point
10 of bedrock, that's all the
11 contaminated soil that exists. That's
12 it. There is no more contaminated
13 soil once you get down to bedrock.
14 Okay. At bedrock there is a
15 difference how much contaminated
16 groundwater is underneath that. What
17 we would be proposing is treat all the
18 contaminated soil. Whatever is left
19 over after if the water evaporated

20 dozens of years ago we would be
21 treating those contaminants that had
22 been absorbed and stayed behind in the
23 soil; all of it.

24 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: What
25 guarantee does my family or any family

1 in the Village of Maybrook or the Town
2 of Hamptonburgh have that their wells
3 and my drinking water, or their
4 drinking water is not affected in
5 perpetuity?

6 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, you
7 know, as John indicated earlier too,
8 there are no guarantees. But I would
9 like to say we have carefully thought
10 out a monitoring plan. We have
11 installed a series of wells both at
12 the site, at the perimeter of the
13 site, and off the site directly across
14 the street. We also have a program
15 where we go out, as Mr. and
16 Mrs. Tanner had mentioned, to sample
17 private wells in the immediate
18 facility --

19 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Obviously

20 there's some problem.

21 MARK DANNENBERG: Obviously

22 there is. Now, the information I have

23 received from the New York State DOH

24 letters also say that they are

25 nondetected. The way that it's

1 written that they are nondetect down
2 to the detection level. In other
3 words, the equipment they are using
4 can only detect anything above a
5 certain amount; one part per
6 billion --

7 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Right.

8 MARK DANNENBERG: -- about
9 half a part per billion, and it can
10 only detect them at that level. It
11 shows it's non detectible. It doesn't
12 guarantee that nothing exists below
13 that, because the equipment can't
14 guarantee a solid quality assured
15 detection below that.

16 MICHAEL CYVAK: Sometimes
17 those reports that the lab generates
18 that's sent out in a letter that you
19 folks got and anyone else whose wells

20 are routinely sampled, those were --
21 the reports are kind of confusing.
22 There are lots of numbers on them and
23 columns, and, you know, crazy
24 mathematical symbols, and if you're
25 not used to those, then they are a

1 little difficult to read. So Joe?

2 JOE CRUA: Joe.

3 MICHAEL CYVAK: From the New
4 York State Health Department has
5 offered to meet with these guys to go
6 over that, so that they can understand
7 that perhaps a little bit better, but
8 maybe one thing that we can work on
9 from that is how to make that
10 information more understandable to not
11 only read that, but anyone that's
12 getting that kind of information back.

13 So as far as how your drinking
14 water -- I believe your question was:
15 What's going on with my drinking
16 water? How can we be assured that our
17 drinking water has not been affected
18 by what is going on at the site? Mark
19 just said, we collected groundwater

20 samples. We have wells all around the

21 property.

22 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Who has

23 collected the groundwaters samples?

24 MARK DANNENBERG: Mostly the

25 responsible party, the owner of the

1 property. There have been -- there
2 have been several instances where we
3 take split samples --

4 MICHAEL CYVAK: Which means we
5 collect samples along with the
6 responsible parties.

7 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: So this has
8 been an impartial observer, if you
9 will, and there has been a chain of
10 custody for all --

11 MARK DANNENBERG: Chain of
12 custody, yes, which we have, yes.

13 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Okay. So
14 if you cannot furnish a guarantee,
15 then if something does happen and is
16 directly related to this situation, I
17 just want to know where the papers
18 should be filed?

19 (Interruption by cellphone.)

20 Time noted 8:17 p.m.)

21 JOE CRUA: Mark, you mentioned

22 earlier that no new contamination was

23 detected by off-site --

24 MICHAEL CYVAK: Groundwater,

25 correct, above drinking water

1 standards.

2 JOE CRUA: So implementation
3 of the remedy further reduces that?

4 MICHAEL CYVAK: Correct.

5 JOE CRUA: I mean, I
6 understand your concern about what was
7 going on with the dumping was -- was
8 happening, certainly some was
9 evaporating, some was absorbing in the
10 groundwater, some were migrating.

11 Right now --

12 (Interruption by cellphone.

13 Time noted 8:18 p.m.)

14 But, I mean, at this point in
15 time, based on analytical information
16 you're not getting the off-site
17 migration. So you're not able to --
18 as we're seeking the groundwater
19 samples, it's going to reduce

20 certainly within implementation of the

21 remedy. So basically --

22 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: So, again,

23 to repeat my question, and this will

24 be the last for now, if something

25 occurs from a health standpoint to my

1 family or any family, okay, as a
2 result of the situation out there
3 caused by Nepera issued by the DEC,
4 which agency or which company are we
5 going to direct our focus to?

6 JOHN LaPADULA: If you have a
7 concern, you can write to us, and we
8 will answer you.

9 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: I will,
10 you --

11 JOHN LaPADULA: It will
12 happen.

13 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: -- work on
14 it.

15 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Do you have
16 another copy of that letter?

17 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Only one.

18 MARK DANNENBERG: Okay. I
19 respect that, and I'm sure if you sent

20 it to me -- do you have the address

21 you sent it to; 290 Broadway.

22 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: It says,

23 "Mr. Mark Dannenberg, EPA Region Two,

24 290 Broadway --

25 MARK DANNENBERG: That's my

1 address.

2 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: -- 18th

3 Floor --

4 MARK DANNENBERG: Ah.

5 JOHN LaPADULA: Ah.

6 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: -- New

7 York, New York 100 --

8 MARK DANNENBERG: I'm on the

9 20th floor. It will find me. So I

10 have not seen it.

11 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Get Buffalo

12 Bill back. Thank you.

13 JOE CRUA: Check with the Town

14 Clerk, and we'll make you a copy.

15 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: Is there a

16 charge?

17 (Laughter.)

18 I'm the Mayor of Maybrook, you

19 know.

20 (Laughter.)

21 DAN McGUIRE: Dan McQuire, 618
22 Homestead Avenue, Maybrook, New York.

23 When was the last testing done that

24 you compiled --

25 MARK DANNENBERG: The last

1 testing of the private wells in the
2 area has been conducted, I'm sure,
3 within the last six months.

4 JOE CRUA: In June.

5 MARK DANNENBERG: In June.

6 DAN McGUIRE: Did you realize
7 in May this whole area was flooded
8 out?

9 MARK DANNENBERG: No. I know,
10 you know, I know we have --

11 DAN McGUIRE: Where they were
12 taking people out of their homes in
13 boats.

14 MARK DANNENBERG: No, I didn't
15 know that.

16 DAN McGUIRE: Right in the
17 area where the dump site is.

18 ROBERT TANNER: Right where
19 the dump was.

20 DAN McGUIRE: And in the
21 letter that I got off, and I think
22 it's put out by Nepera, it wasn't a
23 leak. It was leaks. State inspectors
24 detected leaks from the lagoons in
25 1958 through 1960.

1 MARK DANNENBERG: Right.

2 DAN McGUIRE: So three years
3 of leaks.

4 MARK DANNENBERG: Right.

5 DAN McGUIRE: It wasn't a
6 leak. It was leaks. It doesn't say
7 how many. Or, how many lagoons were
8 leaking.

9 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Yes.

10 RICHARD CATERA: Richard
11 Catera, Councilman for Town of
12 Hamptonburgh. If you look on that
13 wall there, you'll see a plaque we're
14 under groundwater -- we're under --
15 you indicated that there was -- there
16 was -- chemicals detected in
17 groundwater of the aquifer. We sit on
18 some of the largest water reserves in
19 the county. That aquifer goes all the

20 way down to New Jersey. So my
21 question to you is this: You have a
22 charge in there of contamination of
23 the groundwater. Is that groundwater
24 detected in overburden, or how far was
25 the aquifer affected by this and your

1 correct remediation plan isn't a
2 guarantee that that aquifer is not
3 going to be affected in the future.

4 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, again,
5 guarantees are difficult, but our
6 remedial selection will impact and
7 will clean up in both aquifers. So it
8 will impact both the overburden and
9 the bedrock.

10 RICHARD CATERA: How far to
11 contaminate right now? How far to
12 contaminate the aquifers and affect
13 the overburden?

14 MARK DANNENBERG: No, it
15 includes the bedrock too. The bedrock
16 too is contained on site. We have not
17 detected contamination beyond the site
18 in bedrock wells. We do -- we do
19 sample every time we go out, sample

20 wells. So there are deep wells in the
21 bedrock. There are shallow bedrock
22 wells. The bedrock starts -- it's not
23 that deep. Based on the site, we're
24 looking at it starting at somewhere
25 between eight and 20 feet, and that's

1 the depth of bedrock on the site.

2 RICHARD CATERA: That aquifer
3 is quite large, and that water can
4 travel.

5 MARK DANNENBERG: Yes.

6 RICHARD CATERA: So that's why
7 I was concerned about your remediation
8 going to affect the long term.

9 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, we're
10 hoping, I mean, to some extent this
11 has gone on for a while. We have seen
12 contaminants spread only so far. I
13 believe to some extent there is
14 already some biodegradation going on.
15 What we would do is stimulate that
16 significantly to eliminate, you know,
17 eliminate the problem. It would take
18 a couple of years.

19 RICHARD CATERA: With all due

20 respect, I can't hope. I've got to

21 know. That's what I'm saying. I

22 think that --

23 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, we

24 know, you know, there is no magic

25 bullet on this. So there is nothing

1 that we can do that would be
2 instantaneous. So what we've done
3 is -- is, I think our best job, is
4 taking data that we have from a site,
5 where we have -- we have 39
6 groundwater monitoring wells at that
7 site plus we monitor private wells off
8 site --

9 RICHARD CATERA: How far away?

10 MARK DANNENBERG: How far away
11 on the private wells?

12 RICHARD CATERA: Yeah.

13 MARK DANNENBERG: We sample
14 Tanner's well. We sampled Walter
15 Shaves well across the street. We
16 sampled the private well directly
17 across from the access road into to
18 the site, which is next to Walter
19 Shaves' house. There are a couple of

20 additional wells. I don't know the
21 families' names. East of that there
22 were also samples.

23 RICHARD CATERA: You have
24 haven't really moved off site to prove
25 that --

1 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, all
2 the residences are off site. And
3 these are the immediate, you know,
4 these would be of immediate concern.
5 So we feel if it hasn't hit that or
6 anywhere else on groundwater
7 monitoring on the outskirts, it's not
8 impacted beyond that either.

9 CECILIA ECHOLS: Sir.

10 MIKE SCOTSCO: Mike Scotsco.
11 I'm at 80 Maybrook Road.

12 Question, the test wells; I
13 was reviewing your volumes of the
14 test. You don't detect where the test
15 was placed. I don't have a map to see
16 where the test wells were positioned
17 on the ground.

18 MARK DANNENBERG: The
19 groundwater monitoring wells?

20 MIKE SCOTSCO: The groundwater

21 monitoring wells.

22 MARK DANNENBERG: There are

23 figures in the document. I assume you

24 looked at the remedial investigation?

25 MIKE SCOTSCO: I did. You

1 mentioned the 32 test wells in the --
2 you also talked about 27 -- 27 test
3 wells on site. I guess the other five
4 test wells are --

5 MARK DANNENBERG: We have
6 another off site too.

7 MIKE SCOTSCO: Right.
8 Mr. Schaffer brought on the point on
9 custody, chain of custody. If Nepera
10 is producing the reports, it behooves
11 them to hide the most contagious
12 reports.

13 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, it's
14 true. There would be criminality
15 involved in that too.

16 MIKE SCOTSCO: But you have to
17 catch them. If you don't have a chain
18 of custody, you can't catch them.

19 MARK DANNENBERG: We do have

20 chain of custody.

21 MIKE SCOTSCO: You have chain

22 of custody, but the people performing

23 the testing, taking samples off the

24 ground, is there a log indicating on

25 this test well how many samples were

1 taken, a controlled -- control of that
2 number of samples through final report
3 showing that nothing was left out in
4 between? That impacts liability.

5 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, I'm
6 sure --

7 JOHN LaPADULA: That you --
8 you described the chain of custody.
9 It starts with the sample collection
10 and it travels with the samples to the
11 laboratory to show that --

12 MIKE SCOTSCO: But on the
13 collection, what I'm driving at is --

14 JOHN LaPADULA: Right.

15 MIKE SCOTSCO: -- if during
16 the collection they note there is a
17 anomaly a high anomaly, they don't put
18 that into their final report, the
19 reason -- well, that's one question.

20 The second question --

21 JOHN LaPADULA: Let me just

22 respond to that quickly. We have

23 oversight of the sample collection.

24 In other words, when they're there

25 sampling, we are there as well or we

1 have contractors there as well
2 splitting samples or observing, so
3 that one doesn't get thrown in the
4 woods; it goes into the ice chest, and
5 it goes off to the laboratory, if that
6 helps answer your question. We do
7 have oversight of the sampling. Any
8 activity on the property we would have
9 a presence --

10 MIKE SCOTSCO: You feel
11 confident that you have adequate
12 oversight and that in the event we
13 have reason to go after Nepera for
14 criminal liability in that due to
15 their malfeasance my family comes down
16 with cancer or my neighbor's family
17 comes down with cancer, and CDC can
18 show an epidemic survey of the area of
19 cancer, plus in close proximity to

20 this dump, which I know of four cases
21 within 500 feet of the dump right now,
22 four cases of cancer, and I'm not sure
23 anywhere else in this area how many
24 cancers, and out of that sicknesses,
25 which are direct results of the

1 material that was dumped into the
2 ground, I think Nepera is going to be
3 forced to effective ways -- ways to
4 protect the pond on the future
5 liability, but one of the questions I
6 was -- I wanted to persue is curtain
7 drains. Are you familiar with curtain
8 drains?

9 MARK DANNENBERG: Somewhat.

10 MIKE SCOTSCO: Curtain drains.
11 On May 11th, 1967, New York State
12 found Nepera was performing curtain
13 drains taking surface water out of
14 their lagoons, disposing of it in
15 surrounding areas. It's in your
16 report, page 31.

17 MARK DANNENBERG: I've seen
18 it.

19 MIKE SCOTSCO: Volume one.

20 MARK DANNENBERG: I've seen

21 it. It was long before my time, but,

22 yes, I have seen it.

23 DAN McGUIRE: We're not

24 holding you responsible for --

25 MIKE SCOTSCO: But what I'm

1 saying is: You're doing all your
2 testing on site. These curtain drains
3 were not on site. They were disposing
4 the water off site.

5 MARK DANNENBERG: They did
6 investigate the curtain drains. New
7 York State was out at the site with
8 the consultant to the responsible
9 party to Nepera. They did dig up and
10 locate about the curtain drain. I
11 imagine that this study that was
12 written about that you're referring to
13 right now, and they did take samples.
14 They did take samples along the
15 curtain drain, and they found levels
16 low in pretty similar to background
17 levels.

18 By "background levels," I mean
19 some that you would find maybe take,

20 you know, on a quarter of a mile away
21 on a similar piece of property. So
22 they did investigation the curtain
23 drain. I know -- again, as far as the
24 curtain drain, I know what I read
25 about it too. That's the only reason

1 I said it was long before my time. I
2 have never seen anything about that.

3 MIKE SCOTSCO: I'm not trying
4 to prosecute --

5 MARK DANNENBERG: I know
6 you're not. I just wanted to --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your
8 comments on population of 6,500, what
9 census was that taken, 1940, 1950,
10 1960? I'm sure it was not 2000.

11 MARK DANNENBERG: I think it
12 says -- I think it says 7,000, and I
13 don't know whether it was the 2000
14 census or the previous one. I'm not
15 positive.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would
17 recommend strongly the census is much
18 higher now?

19 MARK DANNENBERG: How high do

20 you think it is?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Basic

22 ly, I guess that's it for now.

23 MARK DANNENBERG: I'm curious.

24 Do you know what you would estimate

25 the current census at?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I know
2 that Maybrook has grown 25 percent in
3 the last three years.

4 MARK DANNENBERG: And
5 Hamptonburgh? I mean, I think,
6 basically, what we talked about --

7 WILLIAM J. SHIFT: 6,000.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 10,000
9 all together.

10 ROBERT TANNER: I gave
11 permission two years back to dig well
12 on my property. Why is it never tell
13 me what they are getting out?

14 MARK DANNENBERG: I would be
15 happy to rectify that. I know that
16 they are copying you on your private
17 well. That well is associated with
18 the site, but it's public information.
19 I'll be happy to ensure that you get a

20 copied on that also.

21 CECEILIA ECHOLS: What's your
22 name again, sir?

23 ROBERT TANNER: Robert Tanner.

24 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Ma'am. Oh,
25 I'm sorry.

1 ROBERT TANNER: If you're
2 going to dig this soil up, what's the
3 chances of this going airborne and my
4 house 500 feet away?

5 MARK DANNENBERG: Well,
6 precautions would be taken. Again,
7 during the remedial design we would
8 set up --

9 ROBERT TANNER: Wear a mask
10 everyday?

11 MARK DANNENBERG: These are --

12

13 JOHN LaPADULA: No. We
14 actually wet down the soil, wet down
15 the soil so it wouldn't be blowing
16 around, or there would be curtains put
17 up, or something. You know, it
18 wouldn't be done in a windstorm.

19 MARK DANNENBERG: Air

20 monitoring --

21 JOHN LaPADULA: Yeah, there'd

22 be air monitoring at the perimeter to

23 make sure nothing is leaving the

24 property.

25 JOE CRUA: The dust and

1 volatiles; correct?

2 JOHN LaPADULA: Yes.

3 CECEILIA ECHOLS: State your
4 name, again, please.

5 JOY DECKER: Joy Decker. I
6 just -- I think it's evident that the
7 predominant feeling here is distrust;
8 okay. And we all have good reason for
9 that. I mean, environmental issues
10 through history will show you that
11 there's a lot -- there's a lot of
12 reason for distrust. Okay.
13 Manipulation.

14 The EPA is supposed to
15 advocate for us in our best interest.
16 We are surrounded not only by your
17 site, but there's also two empty BE
18 sites listed on this toxic map here;
19 one on Neelytown Road and one on the

20 corner of 207 and Maybrook Road. So I
21 think the EPA needs to take into
22 consideration that we're not just
23 sitting on a hot bed that's been
24 classified as Superfund for a reason,
25 a Superfund site. It has to meet

1 certain levels of poison to be on the
2 Superfund Site, but we need to be
3 insured, and you want our opinion on
4 how to take care of this. We need to
5 be insured that the future of our kids
6 and our grand kids are going to be
7 guaranteed no matter what the cost is.

8 Now, we're here to tell you
9 what our opinions are. You need to
10 find out from everybody else what
11 remedial plan do they feel more
12 favorable towards. And -- and where
13 it says that it's going to be based on
14 the community's opinion, how much
15 percentage of the community do you
16 need in order to issue with the
17 remedial plan that you're going to go
18 with?

19 JOHN LaPADULA: It depends on

20 how many people comment and write in.

21 I mean, if a million people said: We

22 want Alternative Z, that's -- that's a

23 lot of people with a lot of opinion.

24 JOY DECKER: Well, they can

25 express right now what plan they

1 feel --

2 JOHN LaPADULA: Well, that was
3 one of the purposes of the meeting --

4 CECILIA ECHOLS: You know they
5 can go --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You
7 just said they can write in. Are you
8 saying --

9 MARK DANNENBERG: Your
10 comments right here --

11 MICHAEL CYVAK: They count.

12 JOHN LaPADULA: They count.

13 MARK DANNENBERG: -- wish to
14 write or e-mail something in after the
15 meeting.

16 GERTRUDE HODGES: I think -- I
17 think you ought to truck it out and do
18 plan six for this soil. That's would
19 be a --

20 MARK DANNENBERG: That's been

21 noted already.

22 MICHAEL CYVAK: You only get

23 one vote. I see what you're doing.

24 You only get one vote.

25 (Laughter.)

1 GERTRUDE HODGES: Well, can I
2 speak for my sister? She owns half
3 the land.

4 JOY DECKER: Okay. And then I
5 hope the rest of you, like I said, I'm
6 in favor of GW3 and S6.

7 JOHN LaPADULA: That's Joy
8 Decker.

9 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Ma'am.

10 ELLEN McGUIRE: My name is
11 Ellen McGuire. I just had a question.
12 Saying that everything goes okay, and
13 that you put everything in place, how
14 long do you monitor after, because
15 obviously the lagoons were supposed to
16 be safe, and now, for 40-some years
17 later, we're stuck with it.

18 MARK DANNENBERG: We would
19 monitor, I'm sure, for well -- we're

20 required to monitor and do a five-year
21 review every five years. We would
22 continue that process every five years
23 at a minimum. We'd be monitoring the
24 groundwater much more vigorously than
25 every five years, but we'd be

1 reviewing all the process, reviewing
2 all the data, until we can say
3 categorically: We've achieved all
4 clean-up objectives both for soil and
5 groundwater; we're there, and there is
6 no need anymore.

7 We'd actually want to take the
8 site off the list first. There would
9 be no need to continue a five-year
10 review process.

11 JOHN LaPADULA: While the
12 groundwater and soil would be
13 biodegrading, we would monitor that to
14 see the effectiveness of the
15 treatment. Before we're done with the
16 site, we have to achieve what we call
17 remedial action objectives. That
18 would be drinking water standards.
19 The ground water would have to return

20 to drinking water quality. At some
21 point, it would. How long after that
22 would we monitor? Probably several
23 quarters or years.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well,
25 if they keep it in that biocell --

1 JOHN LaPADULA: Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- it
3 would still be on site. So in any --

4 JOHN LaPADULA: Yeah, it
5 would, but the notion is that it --
6 the levels of the contaminants will
7 dissipate until --

8 GERTRUDE HODGES: Supposedly.

9 JOHN LaPADULA: Supposedly.
10 And then the soil could just be, you
11 know, it would be just basically gone
12 out of the soil. You could put the
13 soil back and grade the site, and
14 restore it to, you know, with the type
15 of land that it was prior.

16 JOY DECKER: What if that
17 don't work?

18 JOHN LaPADULA: Then we'd have
19 to do something else.

20 JOY DECKER: Oh, we could have

21 gone back to the plan that cost the

22 most, but was 100 percent effective?

23 JOHN LaPADULA: We could have.

24 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Sir.

25 BOB JANKOWSKI: Bob Jankowski,

1 Town Supervisor. Just wanted to put
2 some perspective with regard to when
3 the site is listed as a Superfund
4 Site. We, we community, readily
5 accepted sampling information as
6 provided by EPA, samples taken by the
7 private companies that or the EPA
8 monitoring, and we came up with
9 this -- you came up with this big
10 volume of deadly materials that were
11 there, and everybody accepted that
12 that's what's there, and so now, over
13 the years there has been suggestions
14 on how to remediate the site.

15 I remember a meeting back in
16 the beginning, where the estimate was
17 like 140 million to, you know, the
18 site originally, and the most
19 effective way back then was considered

20 trucking everything off the site to
21 some other sites, burning it up,
22 whatever, and so now, you have new
23 technology over the years. 20 years
24 later you have other ways that have
25 been proven effective I'd suppose in

1 some parts.

2 The question I have relating
3 to that and all these suggestions it
4 seems like common sense would dictate
5 that if you took everything off of the
6 site that you possibly could, put it
7 someplace else, that it wouldn't be
8 here anymore. Now, maybe a chemist
9 would jump up somewhere and say that
10 may not necessarily be the most
11 effective way. Seems like common
12 sense.

13 But my question relating to
14 that is, regardless of what the
15 remediation plan is that's going into
16 effect, how long, and somebody may
17 have asked this earlier or not, how
18 long is the site tested, and how does
19 the testing -- and I think Mike

20 Scotsco was addressing that -- who
21 does the testing? How long does it go
22 into the future, and who performs the
23 remediation? It's not the EPA? It's
24 a private company?

25 MARK DANNENBERG: Private

1 company would pay for the remediation
2 with the EPA and with New York State
3 oversight.

4 BOB JANKOWSKI: Is there a
5 difference in how long it's tested;
6 whether you truck it away or whether
7 you do a plan for?

8 MARK DANNENBERG: I mean, yes.
9 Excluding the groundwater, the
10 groundwater might require testing for
11 about the same amount of time. If you
12 excavate it away, you take your post
13 confirmed -- your post excavation
14 sample. As soon as the excavation is
15 done, you sample around the edges; you
16 sample in a little bit; outside the
17 excavated area, and you see if you did
18 it right. If there is still
19 contamination --

20 BOB JANKOWSKI: Is there a
21 timeframe then where you keep going
22 back and testing every six months or
23 --

24 MARK DANNENBERG: For
25 groundwater --

1 BOB JANKOWSKI: -- and then if
2 the tests are continually coming back
3 clear, and there is at some point at
4 which there is no more testing?

5 MARK DANNENBERG: Right.
6 Soils, if it was excavated, it would
7 be a single shot. If it was excavated
8 and carted away, you would go out. It
9 might take several days to do all of
10 your sampling. It could be done in a
11 couple of days perhaps, but you would
12 go around the edges outside of the
13 excavated area to make sure you get it
14 all.

15 BOB JANKOWSKI: What kind of
16 trucks do you use to haul it --

17 MARK DANNENBERG: Big trucks.

18 BOB JANKOWSKI: -- containers?

19 MARK DANNENBERG: A lot.

20 BOB JANKOWSKI: How many

21 thousands of truck loads --

22 MARK DANNENBERG: Yeah.

23 You're talking about volatile

24 organics. So the contaminants so --

25 they volatilize. They evaporate. So

1 you'd have to take precautions to make
2 sure that that didn't happen, while
3 you're trucking it out. It could be a
4 totally encapsulated truck. It could
5 have a cover, a permeable cover on
6 top.

7 BOB JANKOWSKI: And is the
8 trust fund or wherever the money is
9 coming from is there opposition from
10 people controlling the trust fund for
11 the spending more money, or is there a
12 limit to the amount of money coming
13 out of the trust funds?

14 JOHN LaPADULA: I don't know
15 if we can really answer that question,
16 but it's kind of outside of the
17 Superfund process in that the process
18 is done based on, you know, available
19 technologies, proven technologies, and

20 looking at all this criteria; one of
21 which is cost. And it's a balancing
22 of all the criterias, which we think
23 would get the best end result, you
24 know, based on all things, all the
25 considerations.

1 So we don't pick the remedy
2 based on the available funding either,
3 in the case where there are no
4 responsible parties and it would be
5 the Federal Government paying store it
6 with some State share, or in the case
7 of there is a responsible party, who
8 would be liable, and we would imagine
9 would be spending it. The cost is a
10 balancing criteria, but the remedy
11 selection isn't based on, you know,
12 the most expensive or the least
13 expensive, because that's all
14 available.

15 BOB JANKOWSKI: Isn't it true
16 that the reason why it's taking so
17 long to come to a head is because of
18 the initial cost factor and the fact
19 that there wasn't any shown

20 contaminants, any movement, no

21 movement shown on the testing?

22 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, there

23 wasn't the urgency. Based on the

24 testing we did, certainly there wasn't

25 the urgency. Nobody off site was

1 being impacted. No private wells were
2 located on the site. So presently,
3 currently there is no direct risk to
4 human health.

5 The EPA has always been
6 concerned with the potential for
7 future impact, future uses. There are
8 a number of reasons that we did the
9 remedial investigation in phases.

10 Early data did show that there were
11 some metals present in the lagoon
12 area, and I know earlier a gentleman
13 had gotten up and actually Mr. Pim had
14 listened to me and sent me a letter 11
15 days ago, and he said, "it's cadmium,
16 barium."

17 Barium is barely inert, but it
18 is a metal, and I don't want to take
19 away from it on that, but he listed.

20 There's all these things in there.
21 EPA looked at earlier data too, and we
22 had some concern that these metals
23 could impact human health, and we were
24 concerned about that. We went back
25 out. We took a whole bunch of

1 additional samples to decide what to
2 do about that. Certainly the remedy
3 that we are recommending would not be
4 effective on metals. So if metals
5 were of a concern, we'd have to select
6 a different remedy. So, again, one of
7 the reasons that this has carried on
8 is that we've had to do additional
9 testing to verify what's impacting the
10 groundwater. What's the -- what the
11 soil really is contaminated with. So
12 I don't know if that really answers
13 your question.

14 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Ma'am.

15 KAREN BREW: Karen Brew,
16 Orange County Land Trust and Rentals.
17 I have two questions; one is regarding
18 surface water. Did you mention if
19 there has been a survey of surface

20 water going through the tributaries?

21 MARK DANNENBERG: Yes. Years

22 ago there was sampling over Beaver Dam

23 Brook upgrading it along side as well

24 as down grading it in the Otterkill.

25 There were sediment sampling done in

1 the early '90's also. We went back
2 out to ensure that there wasn't
3 something different that we should be
4 concerned about this after several
5 years later.

6 We went back out in 2002 or
7 2003, and performed additional
8 sediment sampling, and that was the
9 occasion that I was out in that white
10 suit out near Tanner's pond, the Tyvak
11 suit. And really that was because the
12 bugs were brutal. I wasn't dressed up
13 in Tyvak because of the contaminants.
14 The bugs were bad. There were tics
15 out there. So I was protecting myself
16 from nature, but we were sampling. We
17 weren't sampling for nature.

18 We were sampling contaminants,
19 and the contaminants came out clean.

20 They were similar both upgrades, both
21 downgrades, as well as adjacent to the
22 property, and all the samples were
23 pretty similar.

24 KAREN BREW: Would there be
25 any concern to, as Mike McGuire

1 mentioned about even if there are
2 flooding in that area, is there any
3 concern with surface run off?

4 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, the
5 surface soil is not contaminated. The
6 contamination is at depth. There has
7 been -- you mentioned the flooding in
8 May, Mr. McGuire, and I imagine every
9 year you've got flooding, you know,
10 even periodically --

11 DAN McGUIRE: No --

12 MARK DANNENBERG: -- maybe not
13 every year. This was really -- this
14 was like the one out of 50 or one out
15 of a hundred year-type flood?

16 DAN McGUIRE: Nice to spread
17 it out.

18 MARK DANNENBERG: The surface
19 soil, again, not contaminated. All

20 subsurface.

21 KAREN BREW: My second

22 question: What are the plans for the

23 piece of property beyond the time of

24 testing?

25 MARK DANNENBERG: Well --

1 KAREN BREW: -- if you, after
2 eight years, deemed it to be clean and
3 safe, do you have plans for it?

4 MARK DANNENBERG: The EPA
5 doesn't own the property. So we
6 really can't predict that. The Town
7 has zoned this property as residential
8 or agricultural. The EPA was
9 concerned that if this is the way the
10 Town wanted the property used, we
11 should clean up to at least reach that
12 level. Residential is really the in
13 general the most stringent, the most
14 conservative clean up, and that's what
15 these remedies, aquifer remedy, is
16 aimed at achieving. Our clean up
17 objectives are based on residential
18 pattern of the property.

19 Whether or not the owners of

20 the property would want to leave it as
21 residential property, leave it as open
22 space, or park land, I don't know. We
23 would be tying along with the Record
24 of Decision certain deed restrictions
25 saying that there shouldn't be any

1 private wells, any drinking water
2 wells installed on the property.

3 The biocell, while active,
4 should not be disturbed. You know,
5 short sampling of the site; dug up,
6 security coming and going on to the
7 site property.

8 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Sir.

9 JIM LORD: Hi. Jim Lord, also
10 Councilman for the Town of
11 Hamptonburgh. Just a quick question,
12 but it seems to me, and maybe I'm
13 wrong, in the private sector, do you,
14 as EPA and DEC, favor removal? It
15 just seems like you see a gas station
16 is being taking --

17 JOHN LaPADULA: Well, yes and
18 no. We favor permanent solution. In
19 other words, we don't remove

20 landfills, because that would be
21 creating more of a problem than I
22 think we'd want. So landfills are
23 generally contained.
24 Love Canal was essentially
25 contained, which many people, all of

1 the people up there were very
2 aggravated about. We didn't clean it
3 up. We just contained it, but we
4 really couldn't, because of all the
5 chemicals that were, you know, in the
6 bedrock canal.

7 If it's a small contamination
8 area, it can easily be removed and
9 taken away. We would probably opt to
10 do that. But it really depends on the
11 type of contamination, and one of the
12 criterion is short-term effectiveness,
13 which really includes what type of
14 adverse impacts might be realized in
15 the community during the
16 implementation of a remedy.

17 For example, for an excavation
18 remedy, you know, digging up
19 chemicals, or, you know, releasing

20 vapors in the air, or dust in the air
21 that type of thing, that's one of
22 the -- one of the criterion. So, you
23 know, it really depends on the size
24 and type of problem. It's better to
25 detoxify, and remove, and reduce the

1 comtaminants, where, you know, you're
2 done with them that way than
3 necessarily pick them up, take them
4 away, and bring them somewhere else;
5 probably be burying them somewhere
6 else. We do do that at, you know,
7 other sites for the circumstances.
8 That's what we do, you know, recommend
9 or propose.

10 KAREN BREW: One more
11 question. On page six of this list
12 of -- list of chemicals, and then you
13 were talking about oxygenation
14 biodegradable. Are you saying that
15 the chemicals are biodegradable?

16 MARK DANNENBERG: Yes.

17 KAREN BREW: Why haven't they
18 gone away in 50 years?

19 MARK DANNENBERG: Well, there

20 likely has been biodegradation that
21 has been going on. At some point the
22 conditions, the nutritional value of
23 the soil, the condition of the soil,
24 itself, was not conducive to that
25 anymore. Yeah, it got used up. Yeah,

1 it's a good way to really think about
2 it. It's in the soil, and with the
3 proper things provided, biodegradation
4 did occur; it got used up.

5 So what we would be doing in
6 our preferred remedy is adding things
7 to stimulate biodegradation. We'd
8 probably be adding much more than
9 would be there naturally, but we would
10 be simulating biodegradation, and
11 these compounds, you know,
12 particularly the benzene, toluene,
13 xylene, these are used frequently for
14 petroleum masses underground storage
15 tanks that leaked and, you know, some
16 of these contaminants are analogous to
17 that.

18 CECEILIA ECHOLS: Anymore more
19 questions?

20 Okay. We're going to close.
21 I would like to thank everyone for
22 coming out this evening. Please also
23 remember the public comment period
24 ends on August 29th. If you have any
25 questions, you can always call the 800

1 number. It's 1-800-346-5009.

2 Many documents relating to the

3 site are on the web page. Please

4 remember on the proposed plan on the

5 bottom you can visit the web page.

6 You can always send your comments to

7 Mark Dannenberg. His address is here

8 on the front of the proposed plan.

9 Thank you very much for coming out.

10 (Time noted 8:51 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.
3 COUNTY OF DUTCHESS)

4

5 I, ROSEMARIE CUMMINGS, a Court

6 Reporter and Notary Public of the

7 State of New York, do hereby certify

8 that the foregoing Hearing taken at

9 the time and place aforesaid, is a

10 true and correct transcription of my

11 shorthand notes.

12 I further certify that I am

13 neither counsel for nor related to any

14 party to said action, nor in any way

15 interested in the result or outcome

16 thereof.

17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have

18 hereunto set my hand this 27th day of

19 August, 2007.

20

21

22

ROSEMARIE CUMMINGS

23

24

25

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

APPENDIX V-c

PUBLIC NOTICE PUBLISHED IN THE
TIMES-HERALD RECORD
ON JULY 31, 2007



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
INVITES PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE
PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE
NEPERA CHEMICAL COMPANY SITE
TOWN OF HAMPTONBURGH, ORANGE COUNTY, NEW YORK**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announces the opening of a **30-day comment period** on the Proposed Plan and preferred alternative to address contamination at the Nepera Chemical Company site in Hamptonburgh, New York. The comment period **begins on July 31, 2007 and ends on August 29, 2007**. As part of the public comment period, EPA will hold a public meeting on **Thursday, August 16, 2007** at 7:00 PM at the Hamptonburgh Town Hall, 18 Bull Road, Campbell, New York. To learn more about the meeting you can contact Ms. Cecilia Echols, EPA's Community Involvement Specialist, at 212-637-3678 or 1-800-346-5009 or visit our website at www.epa.gov/region2/superfund/npl/neperachemical.

The site is listed on the Superfund National Priorities List. EPA recently concluded a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) for the site to assess the nature and extent of contamination in site media and to evaluate alternatives to cleanup the site. Based upon the results of the RI/FS, EPA has prepared a Proposed Plan which describes the findings of the remedial investigation and potential remedy evaluations detailed in the feasibility study and provides the rationale for recommending the preferred alternative.

The preferred alternative for cleanup of the site:

- Excavation of site soils in the contaminant source area;
- Design and construction of a biocell to contain the excavated soil;
- Installation of a soil vapor extraction system; and
- Operation of the biocell and the soil vapor extraction system to remediate contaminated soil.

In addition, the excavated area will be treated with oxygenating compounds to create an aerobic environment and, thereby, stimulate biodegradation within the area of elevated groundwater contamination. Institutional controls, monitoring, and periodic reviews would also be part of the remedy to ensure that the remedy remains protective of public health and the environment. During the **August 16 public meeting**, EPA representatives will be available to further elaborate on the reasons for recommending the preferred remedy and public comments will be received.

The RI Report, FS Report, Risk Assessment, Proposed Plan and other site-related documents are available for public review at the information repositories established for the site at the following locations:

Hamptonburgh Town Hall: 18 Bull Road, Campbell Hall, New York 10916 (845) 427-2424
Hours: Mon. - Fri., 9 AM - 3:30PM

USEPA Region II: Superfund Records Center, 290 Broadway, 18th Floor, New York, NY 10007-1866,
(212) 637-4308
Hours: Mon. - Fri., 9 AM - 5 PM

EPA relies on public input to ensure that the selected remedy for each Superfund site meets the needs and concerns of the local community. It is important to note that although EPA has identified a preferred alternative for the site, no final decision will be made until EPA has considered all public comments received during the public comment period. EPA will summarize these comments along with EPA's responses in a Responsiveness Summary, which will be included in the Administrative Record file as part of the Record of Decision. **Written comments and questions regarding the Nepera Chemical Company site, postmarked no later than August 29, 2007, may be sent to:**

Mark Dannenberg, Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
290 Broadway, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10007-1866
Telefax: (212) 637-4251
email: dannenberg.mark@epa.gov

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

APPENDIX V-d

PUBLIC MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET
AUGUST 16, 2007



Nepera Chemical Superfund Site
 Campbell, New York
 Hamptonburg Town Hall

Thursday, August 16, 2007 @ 7:00PM
 ATTENDEES
 (Please Print Clearly)

NAME	STREET	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	REPRESENTING	Are you currently on the mailing list?
Susan Spear	Congressman Dean Hall 255 Main Street	Coshoon	10924	845-291-1100	Congressman Dean Hall	
RAJUL VERMA	1278 Route 300	NEWBURGH	12550	845-567-6530	KLEINFELDER, INC	N
Matthew A. Triomp	455 Tower Ave	Maybrook	12543	845-487-2272	Wilcox	Maybrook N
Joe Trancemonts	89 Maybrook Rd.	Campbell Hall	10916	427-2349		
Anthony Perre HA	417 River St	Troy NY	12180	1800458	NYS DOT	ed 27880 YES
DAN MARURE	618 HOMESTEAD AVE	MAYBROOK	NY	12543		427-2968 N
Dorlene Ruesler	907 Tower Ave	Maybrook NY	12543	427-5564		



Nepera Chemical Superfund Site
Campbell, New York
Hamptonburg Town Hall

Thursday, August 16, 2007 @ 7:00PM
ATTENDEES
(Please Print Clearly)

NAME	STREET	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	REPRESENTING	Are you currently on the mailing list?
Rich May Field	255 Main St	Goshen	NY 10916	845-487-6749	Orange County	Yes
JAMES DeWinstor Jr	P.O. Box 42	Carrollville	N.Y.	10919	845-34-4541	(V) No/Yes
MARLYN K. ALTZ	109 Maybrook Road	Campbell Hill	NY 10916	845-487-6749		Yes
ANDREW FARRME	41 JONES LANE	MONTGOMERY	NY 12549			NO
KAREN KAIX	Box 2442 Middleton	NY 10746	845-343-8401		Orange County Land Trust	NO
Stephanie Thompson	P.O. Box 72	Campbell Hill	NY 10916	845-487-6749		NO
Rich McCombs	41 High St	Goshen	NY 10916			NO



Nepera Chemical Superfund Site
Campbell, New York
Hamptonburg Town Hall

Thursday, August 16, 2007 @ 7:00PM
ATTENDEES
(Please Print Clearly)

NAME	STREET	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	REPRESENTING	Are you currently on the mailing list?
MICHAEL KLING	27 JONES DR	HIGHLAND MILLS	10970	845 774 5843	VILLAGE OF WOODBURG	N
Patricia Tanner	46 Mc Bride Lane	Campbell	N.Y.	10916		
AAT MORRIS	318 RIDGE RD	CAMPBELL HALL	10916	845 496 9059		Y
JOHN BEUTNER	10 SAEA RD	CAMPBELL HALL	10916	845 496 4757		X
Irene Drake	288 Rt 207	Campbell Hall	10916	845 206 5335		
Jessy Damboree	288 Rt 207	Campbell	Hamptonburg			
MYLES ARON	370 HILSETOWN	BOONING GROVE	10914	845 496 4317	TOMAHAWK LAKE ASSOC.	N



Nepera Chemical Superfund Site
Campbell, New York
Hamptonburg Town Hall

Thursday, August 16, 2007 @ 7:00PM
ATTENDEES
(Please Print Clearly)

NAME	STREET	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	REPRESENTING	Are you currently on the mailing list?
Paul Garce	1187 Folsby Dr	Watkins	PA 17382	610-455-0898		No
Alex Carouse	Highland Mills	10930	845-925-6740	Woodbury	Ad	
Neil Coure	PO Box 546, Central Valley	NY 10930	(845) 925-7558	Ulster County	Ny	
Joseph Kerpessow	468 S. F. Road	to Middletown	NY 245692276			
Joe Dembeck	6 Knollwood	Goshen	ny	01462	Kill Ridge	
James Groved	POB 113 Church St.	JH	10710			
BILL CAUGHLIN	46 HICKORY DR	CAMPBELL	NY	10916		



Nepera Chemical Superfund Site
 Campbell, New York
 Hamptonburg Town Hall

Thursday, August 16, 2007 @ 7:00PM
 ATTENDEES
 (Please Print Clearly)

NAME	STREET	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	REPRESENTING	Are you currently on the mailing list?
J. J. ...	1918 E.	712-39-410	414-8001	Self
...	41 Jones Lane	Campbell	NY
D. ...	107	Self
J. ...	117	Self
M. ...	80	Self
S. ...	Albany	...	12235	518-462-9775	NYS DEC	NO
DANIEL M. JURECHKO	9 HULL RD	MIDDLE TOWN	NY	10941	SELF	NO



Nepera Chemical Superfund Site
Campbell, New York
Hamptonburg Town Hall

Thursday, August 16, 2007 @ 7:00PM
ATTENDEES
(Please Print Clearly)

NAME	STREET	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	REPRESENTING	Are you currently on the mailing list?
Tom Decker	Rt 207	Campbell	N.Y.S.		property owner / family	
Judith Decker	50 Hamptonburg Rd	Campbell	N.Y.S.		property owner	
John Decker	Hamptonburg					
CURT TAYLOR	592 STATE ROUTE 29	GREENWICH, NY	12834	(518) 337-1065		YES
Joseph P. Cava		N.Y.S.	DOIT		Axson	NO
Kath Decker	1 Broadberry St	CP	12045			NO
Robin Cause	P.O. Box 605	Highland	N.Y.S.		Walbury Resident	



Nepera Chemical Superfund Site
Campbell, New York
Hamptonburg Town Hall

Thursday, August 16, 2007 @ 7:00PM
ATTENDEES
(Please Print Clearly)

NAME	STREET	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	REPRESENTING	Are you currently on the mailing list?	
Ellen Nagym	618 4th	estead	Ave	Maybrook NY	12543	845-427-2968	no
Karl Bressler	901 Faxon Ave	Maybrook	NY	12543	845-427-5561		no
Mark Schwartz	109 Batic ST.	Campbell	NY	10916	845-427-0589		

APPENDIX VI
COST DETAILS

Cost Comparison of All Soil Alternatives Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. Site Hamptonburgh, New York			
Soil Alternative	Capital Cost	Annual O&M	Present Worth
S1	\$ 0	\$950	\$15,000
S2	\$12,600	\$13,550	\$217,000
S3	\$2,290,000	\$24,000	\$2,647,000
S4	\$2,388,000	\$406,000	\$3,119,000
S5	\$1,211,000	\$460,000	\$2,302,000
S6	\$11,208,000	\$22,000	\$11,228,000

Cost Comparison of All Groundwater Alternatives Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. Site Hamptonburgh, New York			
Groundwater Alternative	Capital Cost	Annual O&M	Present Worth
GW-1	\$0	\$950	\$15,000
GW-2	\$182,153	\$106,700	\$696,000
GW-3	\$1,656,000	\$229,000	\$3,339,000
Gw-4	\$332,000	\$106,700	\$846,000
GW-5	\$191,000	\$106,700	\$738,000

Selected Remedy - Alternative GW-2 – Enhanced Bioremediation with Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring Cost Estimate Summary Nepera Chemical Company, Inc. Site Hamptonburgh, New York		
Capital Costs		
Groundwater Bioremediation System		
	Institutional Controls	\$12,000
	Preliminary Work (design, workplan, mobilization, demobilization)	\$23,540
	Initial Oxygenating Compound Treatment	\$115,000
	Sub Total for Remedial System Capital Costs	\$150,540
	Engineering (10%)	\$15,054
	Subtotal	165,594
	Contingency (10%)	16,559
	Total for Groundwater Bioremediation System Capital Costs	\$182,153
Operations and Maintenance		
	Groundwater Monitoring*	\$80,000
	Annual Monitoring Report	\$8,000
	Site Evaluation	\$7,000
	Site Maintenance	\$2,000
	Estimated Annual Operation and Maintenance Cost*	\$97,000
	Contingency for O&M activities (10%)	\$9,700
	Total Estimated Annual O&M Cost	\$106,700
	Total Projected Present Worth Costs	\$696,356

* Groundwater Monitoring Costs, and Annual O&M Costs, are expected to decrease over time.