

September 22, 2016

BFEL Indemnitor, Inc.  
c/o Chris Aupperle  
One ConAgra Drive  
Omaha, NE 68102-5094

VIA EMAIL and REGULAR MAIL

Re: VRP Status Reports #6, #7, #8 and #9  
Estech General Chemicals Site, HSI Site No. 10196  
Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia  
Tax Parcels 17-0191-LL0244 and 17-0191-LL0400

Dear Mr. Aupperle:

The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has received and reviewed the VRP Status Report # 6, # 7, # 8 and # 9 dated February 8, 2015, August 7, 2015, February 8, 2016 and August 8, 2016 respectively, that have been submitted by AMEC on behalf of BFEL Indemnitor, Inc. (BFEL) for the Estech General Chemicals Site. EPD provides the following comments:

Response to Comments in Appendix B of the VRP Status Report # 6:

1. [Comment 1] It is indicated that limestone rip-rap would be placed over portions of the site where soil impacts exceed direct risk reduction standards (RRS). Please provide design specifications for EPD to review. A maintenance and monitoring plan to maintain the Type 5 RRS area and associated cover will need to be developed.
2. [Comment 3a] In order to address the vertical delineation requirements in accordance with Section 12-8-108(1) of the Act, BFEL proposed to sample well MW-CSX-03D to demonstrate delineation of pesticides in groundwater. EPD does not concur with the use of MW-CSX-03D to demonstrate vertical delineation of pesticide impacts to groundwater as this well is neither onsite nor in close proximity to the downgradient area of the highest pesticide impacts. EPD recommends that the final VRP CSR include vertical delineation data in closer proximity to the MW-111 and TW-8 well locations.
3. [Comment 3b] According to the Response, monitoring well locations MW-105, MW-121, and MW-119 have been proposed as the designated "point of demonstration (POD)" monitoring location to evaluate whether groundwater concentrations are protective of the "point of exposure (POE)," in this case the stream. The following comments have been prepared based on these proposed POD monitoring locations:
  - Monitoring well MW-105 is on the other side of the stream, [i.e. beyond the point of exposure (POE)] and cannot be used to demonstrate that concentrations resulting from the

onsite release to groundwater do not and/or will not impact the POE above established standards.

- While monitoring wells MW-121 and MW-119 are hydrologically located between the POE and the onsite point of release, additional information must be provided to explain how these wells will be used demonstrate compliance as the concentrations of the constituents of concern within these wells are less than those present in the corresponding downgradient surface water sample locations.
4. [Comment 4a] BFEL continues to propose to use the entire off-site area accessible to the Tilford Yard railyard workers as the offsite exposure domain (ED). The ED(s) must be defined and justified in order to establish an acceptable area averaging scenario, including, at a minimum, consideration of the following:
- A remedy baseon on area averaging may require the placement of an environmental covenant in order to maintain the exposure scenarios established as part of the proposed corrective action. Should the responsible party not own the parcels proposed for incorporation into the ED, the responsible party must designate said properties as qualifying properties, and provide documentation that the property owner(s) accepts the proposed area averaging cleanup approach that may result in soil contamination associated with the site remaining in place on their property at levels above risk reduction standards
  - If an offsite area averaging scenario has been accepted by the offsite property owner(s), the EDs must be clearly defined, including a description of the property use(s) for each parcel(s) incorporated into the ED.
  - In addition, please note that when calculating the exposure point concentrations for the EDs, identification of high outliers in the statistical data set may be indicative of a “hot spot” or source area, and warrants either further investigation or incorporation into planned excavation/removal actions.
5. [Comment 4b] BFEL disagrees with EPD’s interpretation and continues to propose utilizing the area averaging approach to demonstrate compliance for subsurface soil as well as surface soils (0-2 feet). As noted in the prior comments, area averaging should not be applied to subsurface soils as the exposure scenarios to subsurface soils, and resulting cleanup criteria, are not based on random exposure to these soils over the entire ED but rather specific exposure scenarios such as construction/utility worker and leaching based determinations. It has already been established that the POE is being impacted as the result of groundwater discharge to the stream. Therefore, a leaching-based concentration must be derived and applied to both surface and subsurface soils outside the Type 5 area. In the event that the criteria established in [4a] comment are met and the direct contract exposure pathway clean-up criteria for the offsite soils is also protective of the leaching-based exposure scenario, BFEL may use an area average approach for the direct contact exposure pathway using surface soil data but not subsurface soil data. Please note that additional soil data may be

required should BFEL choose to continue to pursue an area average approach.

[Comment 4c] This response is acceptable.

[Comments 5-8] Those responses are acceptable.

Responses to VRP Status Report #6, #7, #8 and #9:

EPD concurs with the proposed future actions and pilot testing presented in VRP Status Reports #6, #7, #8 and #9. EPD also shares with your concern that the proposed pilot testing and impacts from the adjacent M&J Solvents site will likely exceed the 5-year VRP implementation period (VRP Status Report #9). If the submittal of the final Compliance Status Report exceeds the 5-year time frame of February 8, 2017, EPD will issue a consent order to memorialize the revised schedule in compliance with the Act.

Please address the above comments in your next VRP Status Report due February 2017. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. Yue Han at 404-657-8678.

Sincerely,



David Brownlee  
Unit Coordinator  
Response and Remediation Program

c: Gregory Wrenn, AMEC

File: HSI 10196