

June 30, 2017

**VIA U.S. MAIL AND EMAIL**

CBS Corporation  
c/o Richard K. Smith, Vice President, Environmental Remediation  
PNC Center  
20 Stanwix Street, 10th Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Subject: EPD Comments Regarding:

Revised Voluntary Investigation and Remediation Plan dated November 29, 2011;  
Progress Report dated October 28, 2011; Progress Report dated April 5, 2012;  
Progress Report dated October 12, 2012; Progress Report dated March 28, 2013;  
Monitoring Report dated July 26, 2016  
1610 Southland Circle (fka "Indcon"), HSI No. 10077  
1610 Southland Circle, Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia  
Tax Parcel No. 17-0192-LL-051-6

Dear Mr. Smith:

The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has reviewed the subject submittals pursuant to the Georgia Voluntary Remediation Program Act, Hazardous Site Response Act, and Rules for Hazardous Site Response, as applicable. The Revised Voluntary Investigation and Remediation Plan (VIRP) was submitted as a revised application for entry into the Voluntary Remediation Program (VRP). That application was approved in our letter dated June 30, 2017. EPD has the following comments:

1. Site Description: The term "site" is used in the Revised VIRP to refer to the parcel at 1610 Southland Circle; however, impacts may not be restricted to the boundaries of the subject property (see Comment 5a below). Please note that under the Rules for Hazardous Site Response, "site" means that portion of the owner's contiguous property and any other owner's property affected by a release exceeding a reportable quantity. When referring solely to the property enrolled in the VRP at 1610 Southland Circle, please use the term "qualifying property."
2. Please develop a sampling and analysis plan for the following and submit it for EPD review in the first VRP progress report:
  - a. Obtaining soil, sediment, surface water, and groundwater samples for PCB congener analysis pursuant to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region 4 *Technical Services Section Issue Paper for Polychlorinated Biphenyl*

*Characterization at Region 4 Superfund and RCRA Sites*<sup>1</sup>. PCB congener analysis should be conducted in addition to Aroclor analysis for soil (surface and subsurface), sediment, and surface/groundwater samples. PCB congener analysis should be analyzed in the various impacted media based on a percentage (10%, but no less than 5) of the total number of samples for soil, sediment, surface water, and groundwater that have been or will be analyzed for Aroclors. Development of applicable PCB cleanup standards for human and ecological receptors should be based in part on the individual congeners present in the various impacted media at the site.

- b. Conducting a vapor intrusion study referenced in Section 4.2 of the Revised VIRP.
  - c. Evaluating the potential for human exposure to PCBs due to potentially impacted porous and non-porous surfaces within the building at the qualifying property.
  - d. Conducting a Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA) as referenced in Comment 6.c. below.
3. Contaminant Sources (Response to July 5, 2011 EPD Comment 5 and subject Progress Reports): The locations of suspected off-property sources for contamination, as referenced in Section 3.8 of the Revised VIRP, should be shown on a figure in relation to the qualifying property.
  4. Site Map (Response to July 5, 2011 EPD Comment 7): The referenced comment has not been adequately addressed and will be further discussed during the meeting with the site environmental professional requested below.
  5. Delineation of the extent of contamination must be achieved for all impacted media:
    - a. Delineation of the extent of known and potential constituents of concern (COCs) has not been achieved for sediment downstream of the qualifying property. The detection of elevated concentrations of Aroclors in the November 2000 sediment sample SED-15 (0.1 to 0.3 ft bgs) indicates that further downstream sediment assessment is warranted.
    - b. Surface Water: Surface water samples should be collected downstream of the qualifying property and analyzed for Aroclors and PCB congeners at a minimum where impacted sediments associated with the release at the qualifying property are confirmed.
    - c. Soil:
      - i. Those soil samples used to delineate the extent of specific COCs should be specified by sample ID and depth either in narrative format, on figures summarizing analytical results, or preferably both. Furthermore:
        - (1) Soil contamination must be vertically delineated to applicable standards before encountering groundwater or a groundwater sample should be collected at the same (or immediately downgradient) location for this purpose.
        - (2) Post-excavation confirmation soil samples do not appear to have been collected in this area where Aroclors were detected above acceptable delineation standards

---

<sup>1</sup> available online at:  
[https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/r4\\_issue\\_paper\\_for\\_pcbs\\_5-15-2013.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/r4_issue_paper_for_pcbs_5-15-2013.pdf)

prior to excavation. In addition, no documentation was provided regarding the origin and soil concentrations of the backfill. At a minimum, both the imported fill (0 to 1 ft bgs) and native soil between the base of the imported fill and the water table should be sampled and analyzed for Aroclors and PCB congeners at pre-excavation sample locations S-104, S-105, and S-106 to determine current soil conditions.

- ii. EPD has noted that Aroclors have not been fully delineated in soil in the following areas:

- (1) Northern Drainage Channel Bank: At a minimum, surficial soil (0 to 2 ft bgs) and subsurface soil conditions should be assessed north of post-excavation sample locations 1+31N, 1+50N, 1+75N, 2+00N, 2+25N, 2+50N, 2+75N, 3+00N, and 4+00N. At least one soil sample from each location should be collected at an elevation equivalent to the sample depth of the adjacent post-excavation sediment sample. Soil samples collected in this area should be analyzed for both Aroclors and PCB congeners at a minimum.
- (2) November 2007 Sump Excavation: Analytical results for the composited sample collected from borings B-16 through B-18 (2-2.5 ft bgs) may not be used for site characterization. At a minimum, soil samples should be collected south/southeast of boring B-1 near the southern boundary of the qualifying property. Samples should assess conditions at 0 to 2 ft bgs and between 2 ft and the water table until delineation has occurred. Soil samples collected in this area should be analyzed for Aroclors, PCB congeners, 1,2,3-trichlorobenzene, and 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene, at a minimum.

d. Groundwater:

- i. Current baseline groundwater conditions must be established based on a comprehensive groundwater monitoring event where all existing monitoring wells are sampled and analyzed for all site COCs, including PCB congeners. Furthermore, demonstration of compliance with site groundwater cleanup standards must also be based on at least two consecutive comprehensive groundwater monitoring events. Not all groundwater samples collected in May 2016 were analyzed for Aroclors. A minimum of five of the groundwater samples should also be analyzed for PCB congeners during the baseline event, which will aid in determining if congener analysis is necessary during future monitoring events. It is recommended that source areas be sampled for congeners.
- ii. EPD concurs that shallow surficial and saprolite stratigraphic units are hydraulically connected at the site. However, vertical COC concentration gradients may exist due to vertical hydraulic gradients, COC chemical-specific characteristics (i.e., density, solubility, etc.), depth of the initial release(s), etc. Therefore, well screen depths should be taken into account, in addition to stratigraphy, when evaluating groundwater contaminant delineation efforts and compliance status. This will be discussed further during the meeting requested at the end of this letter.

- iii. The July 26, 2016 monitoring report indicates monitoring wells MW-8 and MW-13 were not found during the May 2016 groundwater sampling event. EPD considers these wells to be critical in delineating the downgradient extent of groundwater contamination. Please locate these wells and make them useable for groundwater sampling or replace them. If replacement is necessary, please install the replacement for MW-13 due east of the November 2007 excavation area at the former door pit. Furthermore, please install a deeper-screened monitoring well with the screen installed at the approximate depth of monitoring well MW-12D or top of bedrock, whichever is shallowest.
6. Potential Receptors/Exposure Pathways/Points of Exposure:
    - a. Figures depicting potential points of exposure (POEs), as requested in Comment 14 of the July 5, 2011 EPD letter, should be provided as part of the CSM for the site, and updated as necessary in future submittals.
    - b. Human Receptors:
      - i. As stated in Comment 14.b.i of the July 5, 2011 EPD letter, the visual evidence provided is not sufficient to eliminate trespassers as potential receptors. Further evaluation of the potential for trespassers and the need for appropriate controls is warranted along the northern boundary of the qualifying property.
      - ii. In addition to the potential exposure routes referenced in Section 4.0 of the Revised VIRP, commercial workers should be considered receptors for contamination for:
        - (1) Those areas where shallow soil is not in compliance with Type 3/4 RRS and not covered by a barrier.
        - (2) Those areas where concrete/asphalt and other porous and non-porous construction materials may have been impacted by PCBs, which has not been determined at this time.
    - c. Ecological Receptors: As stated in past EPD communications, an ecological risk assessment must be conducted at the site. At a minimum, a SLERA<sup>2</sup> is needed for areas where surface water and/or sediment have been impacted by the release at the qualifying property.
  7. Site-Specific Delineation Criteria and Standards for Soil and Groundwater: Type 1 RRS are acceptable delineation criteria for COCs in soil and groundwater at the site. [Note: Type 2 or Type 1/2 RRS (general residential RRS) may also be used as delineation standards for soil, but not groundwater.] Please revise the proposed delineation standards and update figures and tables accordingly.
  8. Cleanup Criteria/Action Levels:
    - a. Proposed Soil and Groundwater Risk Reduction Standards (RRS): Toxicity and chemical-specific parameters provided in Appendix C of the Revised VIRP and used in

---

<sup>2</sup> technical guidance for ecological risk assessment is available online at:  
<https://epd.georgia.gov/comparison-existing-contamination-risk-reduction-standards-391-3-19-07#Ecological>

- the RRS proposed therein should be updated based on current information from USEPA, which can be found in the Regional Screening Level Tables. Please present updated RRS in the first VRP progress report.
- b. PCB/Aroclor RRS and Cleanup Standards will be dependent in part on the results of the congener analysis referenced in Comment 2 above.
  - c. While Type 5 RRS may be used as cleanup standards for impacted soil at the qualifying property, EPD recommends establishing Type 1 through 4 RRS to fully evaluate compliance options.
  - d. Non-residential RRS may be acceptable cleanup criteria for groundwater beneath the qualifying property as long as it can be demonstrated that remediation to stricter standards is not necessary for the protection of downgradient receptors (e.g., Woodall Creek, etc.).
  - e. The November 29, 2011 responses to EPD's July 5, 2011 letter states that Type 5 RRS are proposed for site sediment beneath asphalt and concrete cover. Please clarify where impacted sediments are covered as stated. Furthermore, sediment cleanup standards should be based on an ecological risk assessment (see Comment 6.c.).
  - f. Impacted porous and non-porous materials, such as concrete floors, building walls, etc. (see Comment 6.b.ii(2)), may have federal requirements for "decontamination / remediation / cleanup" criteria.
9. The CSM should be updated in each VRP semiannual progress report as necessary to accurately represent site conditions. Please note that the limited figures and tables provided in the subject progress reports are inadequate for this purpose. This comment will be further discussed during the meeting with the site environmental professional requested below.
  10. Groundwater Purging/Sampling Procedures: Groundwater sampling procedures implemented by field personnel are not consistent with USEPA Region 4 SEDS standard operating procedures or those described in other USEPA technical guidance associated with PCBs. EPD will defer further comment regarding these procedures until the requested meeting below.
  11. EPD noted a few apparent discrepancies, errors, inconsistencies, and/or omissions within the subject submittals in addition to those mentioned in the above comments. For example, analytical results for PCE, TCE, cis-1,2-DCE, and trichlorofluoromethane in the February 20, 2013 groundwater sample from monitoring well MW-12D shown in the table in Appendix D of the March 28, 2013 progress report are not consistent with those reported in the associated laboratory reports in Appendices B and C, respectively, or summarized on Table 2 in the same submittal. Please review the subject submittals for accuracy and ensure that future submittals are as free of discrepancies, errors, inconsistencies, and/or omissions as possible.
  12. The remediation of PCBs at the site may be subject to the Toxic Substances Control Act and regulations of 40 CFR Part 761, which are administered by USEPA. It is the responsibility of CBS Corporation to ensure compliance with federal requirements, as EPD will comment and approve submittals with regard to compliance with the Georgia Voluntary Remediation Program Act, Hazardous Site Response Act, and Rules for Hazardous Site Response. EPD



will copy USEPA on comments letters for VRP submittals and recommends that CBS Corporation copy USEPA on all VRP submittals pursuant to the USEPA letter dated June 2011 (copy enclosed).

EPD is deferring approval of a final site remediation plan until comments related to site investigation have been addressed. EPD has not included additional discussion regarding: 1) tables and figures used to document and support conclusions regarding delineation, compliance with cleanup standards, or proposed investigation and remedial actions; and 2) field procedures documented in the referenced submittals. Discussion of these items is better suited to an in-person meeting with the environmental professional in charge of implementing the VRP, Mr. Terefe Mazengia of GHD. The EPD site compliance officer, Ms. Carolyn L. Daniels, P.G., will be contacting Mr. Mazengia to arrange the requested meeting, which should occur as early as feasible after receipt of this letter and before additional field investigative actions are conducted.

The above comments must be addressed to EPD's satisfaction in order to demonstrate compliance with the provisions, purposes, standards, and policies of the VRP Act. EPD may, at its sole discretion, review and comment on documents submitted by CBS Corporation. However, failure of EPD to respond to a submittal within any timeframe does not relieve CBS Corporation from complying with the provisions, purposes, standards, and policies of the VRP Act.

The first VRP progress report is due by December 30, 2017. As discussed, this progress report should include the sampling and analysis plan requested in Comment 2 and the updated RRS requested in Comment 8. If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Carolyn Daniels at (404) 657-8646.

Sincerely,



Jason Metzger  
Program Manager  
Response and Remediation Program

Encl: USEPA letter dated June 2011

- c: Leo M. Brausch, Brausch Environmental, LLC (via email)
- Terefe Mazengia, PG., GHD (via email)
- Joy Gunter Pugh, GTG Properties, LLC (via email)
- Catherine Fox, Fox Environmental, LLC (via email)
- Ken Feely, USEPA Region 4 PCB Program Coordinator (via email)

File: 261-0518 (VRP)



## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 4  
SAM NUNN  
ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER  
61 FORSYTH STREET  
ATLANTA GEORGIA 30303-8960

JUN 08 2011

COPY

Mr. William D. Wall  
Vice President, Senior Counsel  
CBS Corporation  
20 Stanwix Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Subject: 1610 Southland Circle Site  
Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia

Dear Mr. Wall:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is in receipt of your letter dated March 14, 2011, regarding the status of the above-referenced site under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and the regulations at 40 CFR Part 761.

In your letter you did state correctly that absent an EPA determination under 40 CFR § 761.50(b)(3)(i)(A), that PCBs at the site present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment, a person is not required to clean up the PCBs in accordance with the regulations at 40 CFR § 761.61. Additionally, 40 CFR § 761.50(b)(3)(i)(B) provides that a person who unilaterally decides to dispose of that waste is not required to clean up in accordance with § 761.61, but must dispose of the PCB remediation waste in compliance with § 761.61. Please be advised that this section of the regulation further states that cleanup of those wastes that is not in complete compliance with § 761.61 will not afford the responsible party with relief from the applicable PCB regulations for that waste.

Currently, the primary authority for activities involving PCBs resides under section 6(e) of TSCA, where implementing regulations prescribe the requirements for the manufacture, processing, distribution in commerce, use, marking and disposal of PCBs. Unlike many other programs at EPA, the TSCA PCB Program is not implemented under an EPA-approved state program. Under TSCA, PCB issues are regulated at the federal level.

The TSCA regulation at 40 CFR § 761.77 provides for a TSCA PCB Coordinated Approval to be based on a permit or waste management document issued by an entity other than EPA, including a state, subject to review by the EPA Regional Administrator. Under the provision at § 761.77, if the TSCA PCB waste requirements have been satisfied, the EPA could issue a TSCA PCB Coordinated Approval, which would be the equivalent of a TSCA PCB approval for the disposal of all PCB remediation waste from the site. For the EPA to make this determination, this office should be copied on all submittals to the Georgia Environmental Protection Division documenting the management of PCB remediation waste during activities conducted at 1610 Southland Circle, Atlanta, Georgia under the Georgia Voluntary Remediation Program.