

**From:** Miller, Griff <Miller.Griff@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 11, 2014 6:05 PM  
**To:** Steve Snyder  
**Cc:** Hamid Rafiee; Jennifer S. Reese; Ralph Golia; Myers, Rodney; Fisher, Sharon; Hennessy, Joel; Trowbridge, Pamela  
**Subject:** RE: Remedial Alternatives Analysis Part 1

Steve,

EPA has reviewed the RAA Part 1 and has no comments on the technologies screened out and retained for Part 2. However, I suggest adding to the Recommendations section the following two criteria, which are part of the Corrective Action remedy evaluation criteria that will end up being a part of the Statement of Basis for the facility, namely:

Threshold Criteria 2) Achieve media cleanup standards  
Threshold Criteria 3) Remediating the source of releases

I'm sure these two criteria will be addressed throughout the Part 2 anyway, but having them explicitly stated would be beneficial. Additionally, State and Community Acceptance is also a balancing criterion under Corrective Action, but this one is typically handled on EPA's end through collaboration with PADEP and during the public comment period of the Statement of Basis (and you guys do a great job keeping the community informed already), so there isn't necessarily anything the Part 2 would need to say about that one.

Happy Holidays,  
Griff

LCDR Griff Miller, [USPHS](#)  
[USEPA Region 3](#)  
215-814-3407

---

**From:** Steve Snyder [<mailto:ssnyder@groundwatersciences.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 03, 2014 1:20 PM  
**To:** Miller, Griff; Hennessy, Joel; Trowbridge, Pamela  
**Cc:** Hamid Rafiee; Jennifer S. Reese; Ralph Golia; Rodney Myers; Sharon R. Fisher  
**Subject:** FW: Remedial Alternatives Analysis Part 1

Griff, Joel, and Pam,

Attached is a document the fYNOP team has prepared to help us focus on the final remedies for the fYNOP Site. It is styled after USEPA guidance for RCRA and CERCLA sites, and is titled Part 1 because we are still collecting data for the remedial investigation and have not completed the groundwater risk assessment. While we understand it probably has no official place in the PADEP Act 2 program, and may be premature with respect to USEPA submittals, we would appreciate regulatory review and comment to the extent possible. By presenting this document now, we intend to significantly focus Part 2 of the remedial alternative analysis to just a few alternatives. At this time it would be helpful to us if you would review technologies that we have screened out and retained; and our recommendations for Part 2. If there is a technology or a concept that you feel requires additional consideration, it would be useful to be aware of that at this time.

If you would like hard copies of this document, please let me know how many and I will provide them.



**GROUNDWATER SCIENCES CORPORATION**

**Stephen M. Snyder, P.G.**

**Senior Associate**

2601 Market Place Street, Suite 310

Harrisburg, PA 17110

Office: (717) 901-8187

Fax: (717) 657-1611

Cell: (717) 579-8443

[ssnyder@groundwatersciences.com](mailto:ssnyder@groundwatersciences.com)

[www.groundwatersciences.com](http://www.groundwatersciences.com)

*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not an intended recipient or you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.*