RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Riverview Innovation & Technology Campus
Brownfield Cleanup Program
Tonawanda (T), Erie County, New York
Site No. C915353

The draft Alternatives Analysis Report (AAR) for the Riverview Innovation & Technology Campus site has been reviewed by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), in consultation with the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), and was issued to the document repositories on June 5, 2024. The AAR outlined the remedial measures proposed for the contaminated soil and groundwater at the Riverview Innovation & Technology Campus site.

The release of the AAR was announced on June 5, 2024 by sending a notice to the public contact list, informing the public of the opportunity to comment on the proposed remedy.

A public meeting was held on June 25, 2024, which included a presentation of the remedial investigation and alternative analysis (RI/AA) for the Riverview Innovation & Technology Campus as well as a discussion of the proposed remedy. The meeting provided an opportunity for citizens to discuss their concerns, ask questions, and comment on the proposed remedy. These comments have become part of the Administrative Record for this site. The public comment period for the AAR ended on July 20, 2024.

This responsiveness summary responds to all questions and comments raised during the public comment period. The following are the comments received, with the NYSDEC's responses:

The following comments were provided during the public meeting on June 25, 2024:

COMMENT 1: Did the site investigation show a migration pathway to the Northern Drain?

RESPONSE 1: The Northern Drain was investigated in September 2020 and is documented in the *Abandoned Pipeline IRM Construction Completion Report* [July 2021]. As part of the investigation, interim remedial measures (IRMs) were completed to cut the historic pipes and seal them with bricks and hydraulic cement. No current migration pathways to the Northern Drain were observed during the investigation.

COMMENT 2: Were there any river bottom samples taken as part of the Northern Drain RI?

RESPONSE 2: Sediments in the Niagara River have been sampled as part of the remedial program for Site 108 of the Tonawanda Coke (#915055) site. Sampling has been completed in and around the former ponds that were connected to the Northern Drain located at 4002 River Road. No current connection between the former ponds and the Niagara River has been found and further investigation of the area is planned.

COMMENT 3: Who is in charge of Site Management for a Track 4 site?

RESPONSE 3: The Remedial Party is required to implement the Site Management Plan (SMP). Notification to NYSDEC is required for any changes to site use. The Remedial Party is also required to submit a periodic review report (PRR) to NYSDEC at least annually. The PRR includes certifications that all required engineering controls and institutional controls are in place and functional. NYSDEC staff routinely inspect sites while in site management to confirm that the remedy remains in compliance with the SMP.

COMMENT 4: Who can submit a PRR?

RESPONSE 4: The property owner and/or the responsible party can submit the PRR, but the PRR must also be signed by a professional engineer or qualified environmental professional.

COMMENT 5: Is there financial assurance required for sites in Site Management?

RESPONSE 5: Financial assurance can be required by NYSDEC. Based on the proposed remedy and the Remedial Party for the site, financial assure has not been required for this site.

COMMENT 6: Can a cover system be permeable?

RESPONSE 6: The cover system can include both permeable and impermeable areas.

COMMENT 7: Will the Stormwater Retention Basin be adequately sized?

RESPONSE 7: Sizing of the retention basin is outside the scope of the BCP program since it is not necessary to address the contamination at the site. The construction of any stormwater controls for site redevelopment must comply with all federal, state, and local regulations regarding stormwater management.

COMMENT 8: Will the SMP provide control over future excavations on the site?

RESPONSE 8: Yes, an Excavation Management Plan will be a required part of the SMP. NYSDEC must be notified in advance of any excavations below the site cover during site management and will provide oversight for excavation work as needed.

COMMENT 9: Will putting the retention pond in the Track 1 area cause recontamination of that area?

RESPONSE 9: The retention pond is solely for stormwater management. After remediation is completed stormwater that may enter the pond will not have come in contact with site contamination as it is anticipated that it will remain above the site cover or be conveyed in new infrastructure that is not impacted by site contamination.

COMMENT 10: Will the retention pond be shallow enough that there will be no contact with groundwater?

RESPONSE 10: The retention pond will be relatively deep into the native clay so there may be some contact with groundwater. However, monitoring wells in the clay in proximity to the retention pond have not detected site contaminants.

COMMENT 11: How will tree planting be handled with only a 1-foot soil cover on site?

RESPONSE 11: Source materials will be removed prior to placing cover and any excavation, including planting, will have to follow the Excavation Management Plan in the SMP. Additional monitoring and care are needed while planting the trees, but mature trees generally do not have a negative impact on the function of a soil cover.

COMMENT 12: What happens if NYSDEC is not provided with required notifications prior to excavations on site?

RESPONSE 12: The site would be put into Corrective Measures to assess and correct the situation. NYSDEC may also take enforcement against the site owner/responsible party if warranted.

COMMENT 13: Why was there only one Unrestricted Use alternative evaluated in the AAR?

RESPONSE 13: The AAR is only required to have one Unrestricted Use alternative by the BCP regulations. The remedial party may choose which type of other alternatives to be evaluated.

COMMENT 14: Will the consolidation cells be built like a landfill?

RESPONSE 14: Yes, while not a true landfill, aspects of landfill design will be incorporated into the design of the consolidation areas. The cap over the consolidation areas will need to meet the landfill cap requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 360 solid waste regulations.

COMMENT 15: Will water go through the current treatment system?

RESPONSE 15: Not the current groundwater treatment system. A new treatment system will be designed and constructed as part of the remedy.

COMMENT 16: Will climate change issues such as changing water table and large storms be taken into consideration as part of stormwater management?

RESPONSE 16: It is likely that the stormwater system will be designed with climate resiliency considerations, however the design of this system is outside the scope of the BCP. The remedial design will require that a climate change vulnerability assessment be completed to assess what actions are needed to protect remedial systems from the impacts of climate change.

COMMENT 17: Is the pond a retention or a detention pond?

RESPONSE 17: The pond will meet local stormwater management requirements and will be a detention pond. [Note: this response was provided by the Applicant, not NYSDEC]

COMMENT 18: What is the logic behind the Track 1 area around the site perimeter?

RESPONSE 18: It has been expressed to NYSDEC that the purpose of the Track 1 perimeter is to put a clean corridor around the site and help with stormwater management. The Track 1 cleanup goes beyond what is required for planned commercial use of the site.

The remaining comments, listed in the order they were received, were submitted in writing during the comment period. Some of these comments are quite detailed and only the main points of the comments are presented below. The full comments are available in the administrative record for the site.

Bridge Rauch of the Clean Air Coalition of Western New York submitted a letter (dated July 15, 2024) which included the following comments:

COMMENT 19: This comment is titled 'Greenhouse Gas Emission Analysis' and is primarily focused on ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the site during remedial activities. It also discussed concerns about potential emissions from an off-site incinerator.

RESPONSE 19: In recent years NYSDEC has increased its focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions during remedial activities when possible. Measures for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while still achieving the remedial action objectives, will be evaluated as part of the remedial design. Unfortunately, the rail spurs that were present at the facility were removed during the Tonawanda Coke bankruptcy proceedings.

Regarding potential emissions from Heritage Thermal Systems, NYSDEC was not aware of potential issues with this particular facility. However, it should be noted that off-site incineration is not part of the proposed remedy.

COMMENT 20: This comment is titled 'Groundwater and Stormwater Management' and includes many questions and concerns regarding a stormwater retention basin shown in the northwest portion of the site where a Track 1 cleanup is proposed.

RESPONSE 20: the stormwater retention basin is not directly related to implementation of the proposed remedy, see also the response to Comment 7. The stormwater retention basin is not intended to manage contamination related to the site cleanup and will have to be designed and permitted separate from the BCP process. The management of on-site stormwater is the responsibility of the site owner and/or operator.

There is currently no data indicating that contaminated groundwater has impacted the area where the proposed stormwater retention basin is shown. Additionally, the low hydraulic conductivity of

the clay and the plans for the collection and treatment of groundwater upgradient of the basin make it unlikely that future migration could occur. A full retention basin would also be expected to recharge the surrounding groundwater zones, reversing the current groundwater flow direction in the vicinity of the pond. Groundwater conditions at the site will be monitored throughout site management and will be reported to NYSDEC on an annual basis (at a minimum). In the unlikely event that contaminated groundwater begins to move towards the stormwater retention basin additional remedial actions would be required to comply with the remedial action objectives.

COMMENT 21: This comment is titled 'Long Term Site Management' and is focused on who is responsible for the cost of site management.

RESPONSE 21: The cost of any required site management activities is the responsibility of the remedial party and/or site owner. If these entities do not maintain compliance with the SMP, NYSDEC may revoke their Certificate of Completion and any tax credits that may have been issued. See also the response to Comment 3.

In the unlikely event that the remedial party or their successors no longer exist NYSDEC would seek out any potentially responsible parties (PRPs) to finance the remaining site management program. If no PRPs are identified the State Superfund Program would assume the responsibilities of site management.

COMMENT 22: This comment is titled 'Further Concerns' and covers multiple topics including the future use of the site, the use of interim remedial measures (IRMs), and BCP tax credits.

RESPONSE 22: NYSDEC understands the concerns regarding the development of the site as a data center, however NYSDEC does not have the authority to dictate the specific redevelopment selected for the site so long as such use is consistent with the level of cleanup achieved, the environmental easement, and local zoning. Redevelopment of the site for a data center is allowable under the commercial use cleanup proposed for the Track 4 portion of the site.

As noted in the comment, there have been an extraordinary amount of IRMs completed at the site. These IRMs were generally targeted to remove obvious wastes or debris, address ongoing releases to the environment, decommission process equipment and tanks, or test potential remedial technologies. A primary reason that so many IRMs were utilized was that the site was in extremely poor condition when it entered the BCP, and many actions could be completed to remediate contamination/wastes without the need for protracted investigation.

While the former Tonawanda Coke facility is divided between different remedial programs NYSDEC is still evaluating the sites in a holistic matter. Data has been shared between the sites when appropriate to advance the remedial programs. While Honeywell International and Riverview Innovation & Technology Inc. have worked closely to ensure smooth implementation of both the State Superfund and BCP remedial programs, only entities listed on the BCP Certificate of Completion are entitled for tax credits and receive a release of liability. Riverview Innovation & Technology Inc. is currently the only entity that would be listed on the Certificate of Completion.

COMMENT 23: The letter closed with a recommendation to select Alternative Eight, or to take as many steps as feasible to achieve unrestricted use criteria for a majority of the parcel.

RESPONSE 23: NYSDEC evaluates an unrestricted remedial alternative for all BCP sites, however, based on the nature and extent of the contamination present at this site, it is not feasible to achieve unrestricted use criteria for the entire site. An unrestricted remedy would be a considerable undertaking, requiring the stripping of, on average, the upper 4 feet of soil/fill across the entire 86.46-acre site for disposal at an off-site landfill or hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facility. Such action would result in a protective remedy on-site, but would also transfer site contamination to other locations around the state and country where it would require further management.

The remedial investigation indicates that on-site contamination has not migrated off-site in soil or groundwater even with the absence of any appropriate care for decades. The proposed restricted use remedy will exercise appropriate care by consolidating the remaining source materials in engineered consolidation areas, capturing impacted groundwater, and covering the remaining fill in addition to the natural site conditions that have prevented off-site migration thus far and allow for future commercial and industrial use of the site. While these actions are also considerable, they are more implementable than those needed to meet unrestricted use criteria. Thus, the proposed restricted use remedy will be able to achieve a level of protectiveness similar to the unrestricted use remedy while requiring less resources to implement.

James Jones, the former Town of Tonawanda Town Engineer submitted a memo (dated July 12, 2024) which included the following comments:

COMMENT 24: The focus of the memo is the future use of the site, and how it relates to the various planning documents that have been developed for/by the Town of Tonawanda.

RESPONSE 24: Please refer to the first part of the response to Comment 22. NYSDEC does not have the authority to dictate what type of redevelopment is selected for the site so long as such use is consistent with the level of cleanup achieved. Based on the current zoning and surrounding land use a remedial alternative that allows for commercial and/or industrial uses is permissible for the site.

A specific redevelopment plan is also not necessary to select a remedy. When a redevelopment plan is finalized, it will need to comply with the requirements of the BCP program. This can be done either during remedial action or during the site management phase of the remedial program. In either stage the redevelopment work will be subject to NYSDEC review, approval, and oversight.

COMMENT 25: Another concern expressed in the letter is the extent of contamination that will remain on-site under the proposed remedy and the requirement for perpetual site management.

RESPONSE 25: The comment is correct that the proposed remedy will leave contamination on-site. This is possible because the proposed remedy also includes requirements for engineering and

institutional controls to contain, treat, and/or monitor the remaining contamination. The use of the consolidation areas will greatly reduce the footprint of source materials that are of greatest concern and limit the extent of caps/covers that are designed to be impermeable.

The Certificate of Completion holders and/or the site owners are obligated to ensure that the remedy remains in place and effective for as long as contamination remains on-site. If they fail to do so NYSDEC may take enforcement action against them.

COMMENT 26: A comment states that the site will be classified to a Class 4 site on the NYSDEC Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites after completion of the remedy.

RESPONSE 26: Since the site is in the BCP it is not listed on the Registry of Inactive Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites (also known as the State Superfund Program). When remedial action is complete and the Certificate of Completion is issued the site will be reclassified to a 'completed' site (Class C).

COMMENT 27: A portion of the memo raises concerns about NYSDEC's ability to oversee the site under Alternative 5 based in part on the statement that 33 of the required 38 Title V air permits are expired in Erie and Niagara Counties.

RESPONSE 27: The oversight of remedial sites and facilities requiring air permits is completed by separate divisions within NYSDEC. Therefore, the status of air permits at facilities not related to the site in no way affects NYSDEC's ability to oversee this site.

Thomas Morahan of New York State Professional Geological Services PLLC (nygeology) submitted a memo (dated July 15, 2024) which included the following comments:

COMMENT 28: The comment titled 'Conceptual Site Model Dilemma' states that the conceptual site model is "woefully inadequate" due to portions of the former Tonawanda Coke facility being remediated in different remedial programs.

RESPONSE 28: NYSDEC disagrees that the conceptual site model is inadequate. While the former Tonawanda Coke facility is split into different remedial programs it is being managed by the same project team who has access to all the site information. The administrative differences between SSF and BCP does not change site characterization procedures or how the fate and transport of contaminants at the site is evaluated. Through the multiple investigations completed at the larger Tonawanda Coke facility and significant time spent on-site there is sufficient information to develop a conceptual site model to support the selection of a remedy.

COMMENT 29: The comment titled 'Soil Investigation Data Gaps' and is considered a follow up comment to those provided by nygeology on the Remedial Investigation Work Plan.

RESPONSE 29: NYSDEC believes that all of the recognized environmental conditions previously identified in the *Environmental Site Assessment* [2020] by nygeology have been investigated, addressed by an IRM, or remediated prior to the BCP project. In addition to the

current site conditions, the remedial investigation targeted areas for investigation based on historical drawings and records that were present on-site from the historic Allied Chemical Corporation and Tonawanda Coke records.

The former light oil storage area specifically mentioned in the comment was subject to a federal RCRA enforcement action while Tonawanda Coke was still in operation. Documentation of this work is available in Report.HW.915055.2012-06-29.Tank_Removal_Summary_Report.pdf.

COMMENT 30: The comment titled 'Groundwater Investigation Data Gaps' identify several areas of concern regarding potential groundwater flow and contaminant transport.

RESPONSE 30: Each of the areas identified in the comment are addressed below:

Site 110: the contour maps in the RIR are not inclusive of all the groundwater gauging events that have been completed at the BCP site or on Site 110 (Operable Unit 01 of Site #915055). Looking at all the data available between the sites, the area near the border of AOI 2, AOI 4, and Site 110 appears to be a highpoint in the fill groundwater, with flow to both the east and west of this location. Based on the groundwater monitoring completed at Site 110, the only potential significant contaminant migration from Site 110 to the BCP site is in the proximity of Tar Seep 1, which is expected to be addressed as part of the Site 110 remedial program. Additionally, the comment is concerned about Site 110 receiving hazardous waste from Site 109. The recently amended remedy for Site 109 does not include the movement of hazardous waste from Site 109 to Site 110, so this is not an actual issue for long term groundwater quality.

Regional Groundwater Flow: the comment appears to be in agreement with the groundwater flow patterns identified at the site, therefore no response is needed.

Groundwater Flow in Fill: NYSDEC agrees with the potential flow direction in the fill unit proximate to the Production Area identified in this comment. Monitoring wells to the north of the Production Area have had some detections of site related contaminants, which are not indicative of significant off-site transport. Additionally, the *Groundwater IRM Work Plan* [December 2021] has modified the flow regime present during the RI so that fill groundwater north of the Production Area now flows onto the site from the north.

There are a series of fill unit monitoring wells to the west and southwest of the Production area that have not detected site related contaminants of concern exceeding groundwater quality standards. This, combined with the dry conditions observed in the fill in portions of these areas indicate that while groundwater could flow in those directions there is not sufficient connectivity in the fill to realize contaminant transport.

Furthermore, the groundwater in the Production Area will be subject to collection and treatment to further remove site related contaminants from the fill groundwater zone.

Groundwater Flow in Clay: The majority of this comment is concerned with vertical migration through the clay unit to the bedrock aquifer. NYSDEC was also concerned about this during the RI, which is why four bedrock wells were installed in and downgradient of

the production area during the RI. There is no evidence that site contaminants have migrated through the clay to the bedrock. Many of the clay monitoring wells mentioned in the comment are wells that were purged dry prior to sampling, indicating that the formation is not capable of producing significant volumes of groundwater. While there are some exceedances of site related contaminants in select upper and lower clay monitoring wells these are either minor in nature or due to a known condition. For example, MW-13B is located in an area where coal tar was documented in vertical desiccation cracks in the upper clay, which is why there is significant contamination at this location. It is for this reason that this area will be subject to remediation to remove the coal tar from the subsurface. Overall, some exceedances of groundwater standards may remain in the clay units after remediation, but these will be subject to a groundwater use restrictions to prevent exposures and continued monitoring to ensure that the remedy is effective.

A portion of the comment asserts that the piles supporting the coke battery were driven through the clay into the underlying bedrock. There is no site information that supports this assertion. Based on as-built drawings recovered from the site, the typical piling depth was between 10 and 20 feet, with the driven depths ranging from 8 to 29 feet at some locations. At these depths the pilings would still be in the clay. Additionally, there are four clay zone monitoring wells proximate or downgradient of the battery which show no exceedances of site related contaminants.

Calculation of Vertical Migration of Contaminants in the Clay: this comment presents calculations based on Darcy's law to determine that contaminants from the production area could reach the bedrock in approximately 54 years. Darcy's law is useful for predicting the flow rate or flow velocity of groundwater in a given aquifer, but is not meant to be applied to the transport of dissolved contaminants in a saturated soil matrix. The migration of dissolved contaminants through the clay matrix would be expected to be much slower than that of pure water, if any is occurring in to begin with.

The comment appears to be focused on MW-BCP-05C which is screened in the lower clay of the Production Area. Cyanide is the only site related contaminant detected in this well and has varied over three sampling events from non-detect to 1.68 mg/L, only exceeding groundwater standards during one sampling event. Additionally, it is the only lower clay well where cyanide was detected exceeding groundwater standards. MW-BCP-05C has also been purged dry during the sampling events, a further indication of the relative lack of groundwater flow.

Groundwater Flow in Bedrock: this comment states that additional bedrock wells should be installed to determine if there is flow to the southwest in the bedrock. Given the lack of any site related contaminants in the bedrock aquifer this additional work is not necessary at this time. If there was vertical migration from the clay to the bedrock it would have likely occurred at MW-BCP-05D, which is below MW-BCP-05C and as mentioned above had the singular exceedance of groundwater standards in the lower clay unit.

COMMENT 31: The comment titled 'Groundwater Control and Monitoring Concerns' and discusses a series of items related to groundwater monitoring.

RESPONSE 31: Each of the items identified in the comment are addressed below:

Natural Attenuation: The comment is correct that specific natural attenuation parameters have not been directly measured at the BCP site. However, any natural attenuation is meant to be a minor component of the overall groundwater remedy. The groundwater remedial action objectives will be primarily achieved by the removal and consolidation of source materials and the collection and treatment of residual groundwater contamination.

Pond: Please refer to the response to Comment 20.

Hazardous Waste Cells: No hazardous waste will be placed in the consolidation areas, but NYSDEC agrees that the consolidation areas must be monitored in the long term. The details of the monitoring program will be determined during the remedial design process.

Long Term Groundwater Management: It is likely that some of the current groundwater collection trenches that are part of the *Groundwater IRM Work Plan* [December 2021] will be removed as they are in the footprint of the consolidation areas. These will be replaced and/or supplemented with new collection trenches during remedial action. NYSDEC agrees that piezometers or monitoring wells will be needed to monitor the effectiveness of any final groundwater collection system. The configuration of the final groundwater collection system will be determined during the remedial design.

Extended Groundwater Flow Regime: Please refer in part to the response to Comment 30. Synoptic water level measurements have been utilized between the C915353, 915055, and C915003 when access to all the sites has been feasible. While the sites are divided by historic administrative designations NYSDEC continues to look at the environmental conditions in a holistic manner.

Long-term Groundwater Monitoring Program: NYSDEC has long history of monitoring contamination at both State Superfund and BCP sites. Generally, statistical methods are not used, rather NYSDEC prefers to evaluate the contaminant trends within and between wells over time to ensure that a given remedy is functioning as intended.

COMMENT 32: This comment is titled 'Expected Future Data Gaps' and presents concerns about soil vapor intrusion (SVI) given the current lack of a clear redevelopment plan and the potential impact of the currently underway *Radiological Work Plan* [April 2024] on the selected remedy.

RESPONSE 32: An SVI evaluation will be required for all occupied structures constructed within the Track 4 area of the site. Such evaluation must be specific to the structures being built and the area of the site they will occupy, and will include a provision to take actions as necessary to address the potential for exposures related to SVI. All SVI evaluations and mitigation actions will require NYSDEC and NYSDOH review and approval, and will be done at the cost of the site owner or other private entity responsible for construction of the structure.

The purpose of the *Radiological Work Plan* [April 2024] is to determine if any of the slag materials present on-site meet the definition of technically enhanced naturally occurring radiological material (TENORM). The management of TENORM at the site is a waste disposal issue, not a potential health exposure concern, therefore the potential presence of TENORM does not affect the remedy selection but could affect disposal costs if TENORM needs to be removed to address other contaminants.

The remaining parts of this comment are addressed in the responses to Comments 5 and 30.

COMMENT 33: This comment is titled 'Long-term Concerns' and is regarding community involvement in the remedial process and financial assurance for maintenance of the remedy.

RESPONSE 33: There is typically limited community involvement in the remedial design process as it occurs after the comment period on the remedy selection and is highly technical in nature. NYSDEC recognizes that this site is of significant interest to the local community, which is why it helped to create and continues to support the Tonawanda Community Working Group (TCWG) to provide a higher level of community engagement than is normally done for State Superfund or BCP sites.

Please refer to the response to Comment 5 regarding Financial Assurance.

Ian Klenk on behalf of Assemblyman William Conrad submitted a letter (dated July 18, 2024) which included the following comments:

COMMENT 34: Overall, this comment letter was supportive of the progress made at the site by the use of IRMs and was impressed by the amount of work completed in a relatively short period of time. Specific comments on the contents of the AAR were not included in the letter.

RESPONSE 34: No response is necessary.

Sandy Smith of Buffalo Niagara Waterkeeper submitted a letter (dated July 19, 2024) which included the following comments:

COMMENT 35: This comment is titled 'Big Picture' and is supportive of the overall remediation of the site and adjacent sites but raises questions regarding a holistic remedy for the site, the impact of climate change on the remedy, and the continuation of community engagement during remedial action.

RESPONSE 35: While the former Tonawanda Coke facility has been split into multiple remediation sites, NYSDEC does look at the data from the sites in a holistic manner. A primary concern of NYSDEC has been improving the stormwater quality at the BCP site in order to limit downstream transport of contaminants, particularly to the Niagara River. Protection of the Niagara River is a primary goal of the remedial program for all of the Tonawanda Coke related sites.

The effects of climate change are not directly assessed in the AAR because measures needed to protect the remedy from climate change will be evaluated in during the remedial design. Recently NYSDEC has required that remedial parties incorporate the principles of Green and Sustainable Remediation and Climate Resiliency into work plans and designs to reduce the carbon footprint (where possible) to design and implement remedies to withstand the conditions brought on by climate change.

NYSDEC intends to continue to participate in the TCWG for the duration of the remedial action and will issue factsheets regarding site progress at the milestones outlined in the *Citizen Participation Plan* [April 2020].

COMMENT 36: This comment is titled 'Stormwater' and raises concerns regarding the future management of stormwater.

RESPONSE 36: Please refer to the responses to Comment 7 and Comment 20. The remedy is required to prevent the migration of contaminants from soil or groundwater to stormwater. It is not anticipated that future stormwater controls related to the redevelopment of the site will receive water impacted by site contamination.

COMMENT 37: This comment is titled 'Groundwater' and raises concerns about changes in groundwater flow patterns due to increased precipitation from climate change.

RESPONSE 37: It is difficult to predict how exactly how increased precipitation will impact groundwater flow in the fill at the site. The remedy will consolidate or treat the source materials of groundwater contamination which is expected to dramatically improve groundwater quality in the fill over time. Groundwater monitoring will be conducted throughout site management to assess potential changes to groundwater conditions. Additional remedial actions can be required during site management if unanticipated changes to site conditions dictate additional actions to meet the remedial action objectives.