

Georgia Department of Natural Resources

2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr., S.E., Suite 1462 East, Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Reply To:

Response and Remediation Program
2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, S.E.
Suite 1462, East Tower
Atlanta, Georgia 30334-9000
Office 404-657-8600 Fax 404-657-0807

Mark Williams, Commissioner
Environmental Protection Division
Judson H. Turner, Director
Land Protection Branch
Keith M. Bentley, Branch Chief

June 28, 2012

VIA ELECTRONIC AND REGULAR MAIL

Ashland, Inc.
c/o Mr. Mike Dever
5200 Blazer Parkway, Suite DA-5
Dublin, Ohio 43017

Re: Voluntary Investigation and Remediation Plan and Application, January 12, 2012
Tara Shopping Center, HSI Site No. 10798
8564 Tara Boulevard, Jonesboro, Georgia (Clayton County)
Tax Parcel ID 13242D B001

Dear Mr. Dever:

The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has reviewed the Voluntary Investigation and Remediation Plan (VIRP) dated January 12, 2012 submitted by EHS Support on behalf of Ashland, Inc. (Ashland) for the above-referenced tax parcel (the "Property") pursuant to the Georgia Voluntary Remediation Program Act (the Act). As part of the VIRP review, EPD also reviewed applicable sections of the December 21, 2011 and May 23, 2011 Surface Water Monitoring Reports and the July 8, 2011 Pilot Test Effectiveness Report and Groundwater Corrective Action Investigation Workplan. EPD offers the following comments:

VIRP Application Checklist

1. In accordance with Item 3 of the current Application Checklist, the application must include a tax plat or other figure that includes the qualifying property boundaries, abutting properties, and tax parcel identification numbers. The site plan provided in Appendix B (Map 1-3) should be revised to include the qualifying property boundary along with the tax parcel IDs for all abutting properties. Note that abutting properties include those properties located across roads and highways in instances where the property boundary borders a road or other thoroughfare (i.e., Fayetteville Road and Tara Boulevard).
2. Groundwater contamination is known to exist on several abutting properties, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Al-Karim Partnership property (herein referred to as the "Dunkin Donuts" property), Clay Prop VI LLC property (i.e., USA Payday property), Lumsden Properties LLC property (i.e., Prax Air/Pye Barker Welding property), and Sonu Enterprises, Inc. property (i.e., Citgo property). In accordance with our June 28, 2012 VIRP approval letter, Ashland must apply to EPD by December 28, 2012 to include all known impacted properties as qualifying properties under the Act or notify EPD by said date that the known impacted properties will not be included in the program. In the event that no other properties are entered into the program, the Point of Exposure (POE) must be located at the downgradient property line of subject property on the basis that impacted non-qualifying properties will be addressed within the HSRA regulatory framework, whereby all groundwater is considered potential drinking water (i.e., a theoretical POE).
3. The VIRP did not include an itemization of the professional geologist's/engineer's time invoiced with a description of the services provided as required by Item 6 of the Application Checklist. A summary of all work completed by the professional geologist or engineer overseeing clean up activities should be included in the first semiannual report and updated in each subsequent progress report.

Conceptual Site Model

4. Section 3.12.2 of the VIRP states that although a full potential exposure pathway evaluation will be performed as part of the Site-wide corrective action plan, at present there appears to be "limited potential exposure to soil, groundwater and vapor" associated with the Site. EPD does not agree with this statement. The groundwater to surface water exposure pathway is complete as evidenced by Site contamination in the unnamed stream. Furthermore, Ashland cannot predict whether the potential vapor intrusion pathway is "limited" until a vapor intrusion pathway analysis has been performed for all structures overlying source, soil, and groundwater contamination. The first progress report should include an exposure assessment that is consistent with USEPA's Guidance for Exposure Assessment (57FR104: 20888-22938; May 29, 1992).

Investigation and Remediation Plan

5. The VIRP designates Type 1-4 Risk Reduction Standards (RRS) as the delineation criteria for soil and groundwater impacts; however, in accordance with Section 12-8-108(1)(E) of the Act, non-residential and site-specific RRS (i.e., Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4 RRS) are not acceptable delineation criteria. The Type 1 RRS provided in Section 3.8.1 of the VIRP are acceptable delineation standards, except a Type 1 groundwater RRS value for cis-1,2-dichloroethene (cis-1,2-DCE) was not provided. Ashland may use the Type 1 RRS of 70 µg/L for cis-1,2-DCE for groundwater delineation.
6. The delineation criteria for surface water should be the laboratory practical quantitation limit (PQL). The USEPA Region IV Surface Water Screening Values cited in EPD's October 1, 2010 CAP Addendum Notice of Deficiencies (NOD) letter, and subsequently referenced in the VIRP as proposed delineation criteria, are intended for use in developing a Preliminary Risk Evaluation (PRE) for aquatic impacts and are not appropriate for delineation.
7. Regarding the Surface Water Monitoring Report dated May 23, 2011, EPD agrees with the ecological risk assessment conclusion that risk to aquatic receptors is not expected in the unnamed stream downgradient of the Site; therefore, the remedial criteria for surface water impacts will be the current Georgia In Stream Water Quality Standards (ISWQSS) as provided in Section 391-3-6-.03(5) of the Georgia Water Quality Control Act, or an alternate surface water quality value accepted by EPD. As discussed with Ashland representatives on June 21, 2012, EPD will consider Ashland's proposed alternative surface water value for PCE of 62.2 µg/L as discussed in the "Evaluation of the Applicability of PCE WQS and the Proposed Alternative Approach – Technical White Paper" received on June 19, 2012. However, once EPD's Watershed Protection Branch makes a determination on the proposed alternative surface water value for PCE, or determines that higher standards will be promulgated in the short term (next year) which are applicable to the project, EPD expects Ashland to identify and implement corrective action to eliminate surface water exceedences as required by Condition #6 of the VIRP Approval Letter.
8. In addition to the proposed monitoring well locations identified in Section 4.1 of the VIRP, Ashland must also install monitoring wells in the following areas to complete groundwater delineation activities and supplement the Conceptual Site Model (CSM):
 - a. East of monitoring well MW-2 and MW-13 well series. Although the primary groundwater flow pathway appears to be to the west in the direction of the unnamed stream, a potential secondary groundwater flow path to the east has not been investigated; and
 - b. South of the MW-9 wells series on the Dunkin Donuts property. Please refer to Comment 5 of the November 13, 2010 Notice of Deficiencies (NOD) letter.

9. Monitoring well MW-14A had a detection of PCE above the delineation criteria in May 2011. Note that if concentrations above delineation criteria persist, EPD will require installation of a monitoring well north of MW-14 to complete delineation.
10. EPD does not agree that soil delineation is complete. Additional soil samples must be collected in the following areas to complete delineation for tetrachloroethene [PCE] and associated daughter products, as applicable:
 - a. East of soil boring P-30 (10 mg/kg [PCE] - 10', 5.2 mg/kg [PCE] - 20', and 3.75 mg/kg [PCE] - 24');
 - b. East of soil borings P-48 & P-47 (5.4 mg/kg [PCE] - 20' and 6.5 mg/kg [PCE] - 1', 5.1 mg/kg [PCE] - 15', and 9.5 mg/kg [PCE] - 20', respectively);
 - c. North of soil boring P-17 (2.4 mg/kg [PCE] - 15'); and
 - d. South/south-west of soil boring P-45 (5.8 mg/kg [PCE] - 20' and 4.4 mg/kg [PCE] - 25').
11. A point of demonstration (POD) well and POE for groundwater must be designated if the qualifying property is certified using POD monitoring pursuant to Section 12-8-108(4) of the Act. The POD well should be located between the source and POE. Note that if the unnamed stream is closer than the alternatives described in Section 12-8-102(b)(11), it should be considered the POE.

Miscellaneous Comments

12. The first progress report should include a single figure showing all historical soil boring locations. Figure 2-2 (Historical Soil Boring Locations and Monitoring Well Locations) does not include any of the soil data collected by Peachtree Environmental, Inc. on behalf of Tara Retail between 2007 - 2008. Note that the first progress report should also include a revised soil analytical summary table that includes the analytical data from the 2007 - 2008 Tara Retail soil sampling events.
13. In future reports, isoconcentration figures drawn to the delineation standard (i.e., 5 µg/L for tetrachloroethene [PCE]) should be provided for each constituent of concern (COC).
14. EPD has repeatedly directed Ashland to incorporate the 2004 groundwater analytical data collected from the Dunkin Donuts property into applicable figures prepared for the Site. Until such time that Ashland installs a monitoring well cluster on the Dunkin Donuts property, the 2004 analytical data collected from temporary monitoring wells TW-1 and TW-2 must be incorporated into the revised CSM, considered in fate and transport modeling and exposure pathway analyses, and presented on all isoconcentration map and tables, as applicable.
15. Table 2-2 (Summary of Historical Soil Analytical Data) provided in the VIRP includes a note explaining that trans-1,2-dichloroethane (trans-1,2-DCA) was detected in several soil samples collected in 2005. In order to understand if trans-1,2-DCA should be included as a COC. EPD researched the 2005 laboratory report and found that trans-1,2-DCA was not detected in any soil sample above the laboratory practical quantitation limit (PQL) and was incorrectly listed in the summary table prepared by the consultant. To avoid confusion, all references to detections of trans-1,2-DCA should be removed from any tables, figures and text, as applicable.

Ashland must address these comments to EPD's satisfaction in order to demonstrate compliance with the provisions, purposes, standards and policies of the Act. EPD may, at its sole discretion, review and comment on documents submitted by Ashland. However, failure of EPD to

respond to a submittal within any timeframe does not relieve Ashland from complying with the provisions, purposes, standards and policies of the Act.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. Greg Gilmore of the Response and Remediation Program at (404) 657-8608.

Sincerely,



David Brownlee
Acting Program Manager
Response and Remediation Program

c: Eric Nathan, Tara Retail Holdings, Inc. (via electronic mail)

File: HSI 10798

S:\RDRIVE\CWilliams\HSI\Tara Shopping Center_10798\VRP_Ashland\VRP Comment Letter_ASHLAND.doc