

From: Werner, Leah <Werner.Leah@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2022 12:30 PM
To: Dombrowski, Frank J
Cc: Krueger, Sarah E - DNR; Luke, Glenn R; 'staci.goetz@ramboll.com'; Abigail Small (ASMALL@ramboll.com); Julie A Zimdars (Julie.Zimdars@ramboll.com); 'adrienne.korpela@jacobs.com'
Subject: RE: Former Green Bay MGP Remedial Action Work Plan
Attachments: 20220721_EPA Comments Green Bay RAWP.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Frank,

Please find EPA comments to the RAWP Rev 0 attached. I removed the comments that were already discussed with the assumption that they will be incorporated into Rev 1. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you,

Leah Werner
U.S. EPA Remedial Project Manager
312.886.0552
werner.leah@epa.gov

From: Dombrowski, Frank J <frank.dombrowski@wecenergygroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 5:07 PM
To: Werner, Leah <Werner.Leah@epa.gov>
Cc: 'sarah.krueger@wisconsin.gov' <sarah.krueger@wisconsin.gov>; Luke, Glenn R <Glenn.Luke@wecenergygroup.com>; 'staci.goetz@ramboll.com' <staci.goetz@ramboll.com>; Abigail Small (ASMALL@ramboll.com) <ASMALL@ramboll.com>; Julie A Zimdars (Julie.Zimdars@ramboll.com) <Julie.Zimdars@ramboll.com>; 'adrienne.korpela@jacobs.com' <adrienne.korpela@jacobs.com>
Subject: FW: Former Green Bay MGP Remedial Action Work Plan

All,

Please find attached the link to Rev 0 of the ERA RAWP for the former WPS Green Bay MGP. Please contact me if there are any questions.

Thanks,

Frank Dombrowski
Principal Environmental Consultant

WEC Energy Group - Business Services
Environmental Dept. - Land Quality Group
333 W. Everett St., A231
Milwaukee, WI 53203
Office: (414) 221-2156
Cell: (414) 587-4467
Fax: (414) 221-2022

*Serving WEC Energy Group, We Energies, Wisconsin Public Service, Michigan Gas Utilities,
Minnesota Energy Resources, Peoples Gas and North Shore Gas*

From: Staci L Goetz <Staci.Goetz@ramboll.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 3:37 PM
To: Dombrowski, Frank J <frank.dombrowski@wecenergygroup.com>; Luke, Glenn R
<Glenn.Luke@wecenergygroup.com>
Cc: Abigail Small <ASMALL@ramboll.com>; Julie A Zimdars <Julie.Zimdars@ramboll.com>
Subject: Former Green Bay MGP Remedial Action Work Plan

***** Exercise caution: This is an EXTERNAL email. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or in unexpected emails. *****

Frank and Glenn,
Please find the link below to the Remedial Action Work Plan for an Early Action at the Former Green Bay MGP for your distribution. Please let us know if there are any issues accessing the report.

<https://ramboll-my.sharepoint.com/:f/p/asmall/EkhUTwupjGBCreGicCsgAhkBzIxqiRKIKMrEcJ7FKzAaAA>

Kind regards
Staci Goetz

Ph.D.
Managing Geologist

M 414-335-3563
staci.goetz@ramboll.com

Connect with us  

Ramboll
234 W. Florida Street
Fifth Floor
Milwaukee, WI 53204
USA
<https://ramboll.com>



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY
REGION 5
77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD
CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

July 21, 2022

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:
SR-6J

Mr. Frank Dombrowski
Principal Environmental Consultant
WEC Energy Group – Business Services
Environmental Dept. – Land Quality Group
333 W. Everett St., A231
Milwaukee, WI 53203

Re: Review of the Removal Action Work Plan – Revision 0, Former Green Bay Manufactured Gas Plant Site, Green Bay, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Dombrowski,

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the document titled *Removal Action Work Plan (RAWP)* for the Former Two Rivers Manufactured Gas Plant Site, dated June 7, 2022. Comments on the RAWP are provided in Attachment 1.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss any of the comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at 312-886-0552.

Sincerely,

7/21/2022

X Leah Werner

Leah Werner
Remedial Project Manager, EPA Region 5
Signed by: LEAH WERNER

cc: Sarah Krueger, WDNR

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. As part of the Early Removal Action Work Plan, Wisconsin will be imposing continuing obligations on the property for cap (cover) maintenance for protection of human health from direct contact with contaminated soil and for protection of the groundwater pathway. Please confirm if the surface will no longer be impervious following this Early Removal Action and that post-remedial groundwater monitoring will continue under previous conditions in the north parking lot area. Additionally, continuing obligations for residual soil contamination, a sediment engineering control, and future vapor risk will be applied by Wisconsin to the property. Future vapor risk will be imposed because the soil remedy will only address the top 2-4 feet of soil impacts in areas of the north parking lot and trail easement leaving soil above the screening criteria between 4 and 15 feet below ground surface. These continuing obligations require an updated cover maintenance plan and applicable cap figures, and notifications, 30 days prior to the implementation of the Early Removal Action, to Property Owners Harbinger Development LLC, Georgia Pacific Consumer Products LP, and City of Green Bay. These continuing obligations are a state requirement, per Wis. Stat. § 292.12 (2), as part of the state’s approval of the Early Removal Action Plan.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

2. Section 1.2.2, Page 3/40, Please include discussion of the newly identified interceptor pipe that is proposed to be the source of impacted sediment in the cove area and reference Appendix B.
3. Section 2.1.2, Page 7/40: Please be advised that if future redevelopment is performed under Wisconsin oversight, a historic fill exemption is necessary due to the fill identified across the site ranging from 0.5 to 18 feet thick.
4. Section 3.2, Page 11/40: For each metric (each bullet), please state whether it is visual/qualitative or laboratory/qualitative.
5. Section 3.3.1, Page 11/40, 1st bullet: The last sentence implies that removing soil above a cancer risk (CR) level of 10^{-3} and HI of 10 results in acceptable exposure risks for construction workers. This should be reworded or removed since there’s no basis for this statement.
6. Section 3.3.1, Page 11/40, 2nd bullet: It is unclear what the term “unaffected soil” in the third sentence is in reference to (soil at a cancer risk of 10^{-4} or HI of 1, or post-removal action backfill). Please revise the text to clarify.
7. Section 3.3.1, Page 12/40, 1st bullet: While the proposed early action will likely address vapor risk in the Annex Building due to soil, the concentrations in soil left in place from 4-15 feet and groundwater under the north parking lot still pose a future vapor risk. Any future development would need to use best management practices and conduct an evaluation of potential vapor intrusion at that time. Please clarify that the vapor intrusion pathway will still need to be addressed/mitigated in future building construction.
8. Section 4.2.3, Page 15/40: Clearing and grubbing of vegetation is to occur outside of the migratory bird nesting timeframe per USFWS guidelines and for compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Please indicate that the appropriate data searches will be done

Attachment 1 – Comments on the Green Bay Former MGP Removal Action Work Plan – Rev 0

and the USFWS will be consulted on the results and appropriate mitigation measures prior to site clearing/grading activities.

9. Section 4.2.4, Page 16/40, 2nd paragraph: Periodic sweeping of the street surrounding the construction access gate should be included as a best management practice along with signage and covers on all loads entering or exiting the site.
10. Section 4.3.2, Page 17/40: Some effects from soil removal may not be immediately visible after project completion; for example, damage to vegetation. What provisions for post ERA monitoring will be considered?
11. Section 4.4.2.3, Page 21/40: Please discuss how stabilization will be addressed if visual indications of MGP impacts are observed at depths greater than 0.5-feet.
12. Section 4.4.2.4, Page 22/40: Please discuss alternative cap component(s) if materials with visual indications of MGP impacts are left in-place.
13. Section 5.2.1.2, Page 27/40: Please clarify where the confirmatory sampling would take place in reference to the areas as shown in Figure 4 and Sheets C-090 and C-100. It is unclear if post removal cores will be collected within the sediment removal area or all portions of the rip rap removal area.
14. Section 5.2.1.2, Page 27/40: Please clarify if confirmatory sediment cores will be advanced 2 feet or advanced to a depth needed to obtain 2 feet of recovery. Is there a required minimum sample recovery of the clay beneath the undredged soft sediment and/or excavation residuals to ensure sufficient collection of the clay? Additionally, is there a procedure if sample recovery is not met?
15. Section 5.4.1, Page 28/40: What is the anticipated laboratory turnaround time between confirmation sample collection and sample results? What will prevent an area from being backfilled in the event of confirmatory sample failure?
16. Section 5.5, Page 29/40, 7th bullet: The last sentence of the bullet indicates that results will be compared to the site-specific risk-based acceptable air concentrations in Appendix D. However, Appendix D presents air monitoring acceptable air concentrations at the site perimeter based on target cancer risk levels of 10^{-4} , 10^{-5} , and 10^{-6} , and target hazard index of 1. Which risk-based air concentrations will be used for the comparison?
17. Section 5.5, Page 29/40; Section 5.6, Page 32/40; Section 5.7, Page 34/40: Indicate the regulatory drivers and whether this meets the regulatory criteria.
18. Section 6, Page 37/40, 2nd paragraph: This RAWP would not be “accepted” as it is missing several measures to demonstrate compliance with requirements of several significant permit equivalencies. See comments on Table 3. Additionally, since this is a voluntary removal action, EPA is not providing acceptance or approval of this RAWP and is solely providing review and comment in accordance with the Authorization to Conduct a Voluntary Removal Action dated April 26, 2022.
19. Section 7.1, Page 38/40, 5th row: Seeding, tree planting, light pole and asphalt/concrete installation are likely the trailing activities to ERA completion; their inclusion as a standalone task in the schedule is appropriate since completion will bound the timeline for ERA activities.

Attachment 1 – Comments on the Green Bay Former MGP Removal Action Work Plan – Rev 0

20. Table 3: EPA recommends that Table 3 clearly cross reference to RAWP sections that address the substantive requirements of each permit equivalency and/or describe those requirements in sub-rows and a column in the table titled "Action to Meet the Requirement". Regulatory contact telephone numbers are provided but there is no indication of communications with that entity.
21. Table 3: The RAWP is missing measures to demonstrate compliance with requirements of several significant permit equivalencies. Please see specific comments below:
- a. WRAPP: The Requirements column refers to Endangered Species Assessment (ESA) and wetlands inventory. The RAWP should include text regarding these topics or indicate in Table 3 that they were evaluated and determined to not be present (or whatever the case is).
 - b. Chapter 30: If the Waterways Individual Permit (IP) conditions are set forth by regulation, each actionable condition should be provided and how the RAWP will meet that should be described. If the IP conditions are not set forth, and an application will need to be made to WDNR, provide an affirmative statement and, at a minimum, list the substantive general conditions applicable to all permits (or permit equivalencies). Note that the public comment period can potentially be satisfied by the CERCLA community relations process.
 - c. Chapter 281: Section 4.3.3, Page 19 references a potential need for a pre-treatment system prior to discharge to the sanitary sewer. This may require WDNR wastewater plan review of the pre-treatment system. Please include a s. 281.41, Wis. Stats., Wis. Adm. Code NR 108 wastewater plan review of the pre-treatment system in Table 3. The plan review and approval are necessary prior to construction of the system and will not be considered complete upon approval of the Early Action Removal Work Plan unless proper documentation is provided with the revised plan. Additional information related to wastewater plan review¹ and adequate submittals² can be found via the links provided.
 - d. Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404/401: Indicate which Nationwide Permit Equivalency is intended to be used (or why an IP will be pursued if a General Permit is not appropriate) and provide a Substantive Requirements Document which deconstructs the permit equivalency and its General and Regional Conditions, and clearly describes how compliance will be achieved. If a joint permit equivalency application is intended to be submitted to WDNR and/or USACE, affirmatively state this. Indicate how the substantive requirements of the CWA 401 water quality certification are being met, for example, sections on turbidity containment might reference the requirements that must be met for CWA 401 compliance.
 - e. Section 10: Provide a Substantive Requirements Document which deconstructs the permit equivalency and its General and Regional Conditions, and clearly describes how compliance will be achieved. If a joint permit equivalency application is intended to be submitted to USACE, affirmatively state this.
22. Appendix A, Appendix G: Construction worker RSLs were based on an exposure frequency of 30 days/year, with the rationale "Value mirrors EF_{cw} used by IEPA to calculate their

¹ <https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/Wastewater/PlanReview.html>

² <https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/Wastewater/AdequateSubmittal.html>

Attachment 1 – Comments on the Green Bay Former MGP Removal Action Work Plan – Rev 0

construction worker Screening SLs as presented in TACO". However, the monitoring acceptable air concentrations calculated in RAWP Appendix D were based on a construction worker intrusive activity exposure frequency of 65 days/year. For consistency, these values should all be changed to 65 days/year.

23. Appendix C, 10: Include measures to stop spills from migrating or contacting nearby surface water and include provisions of spill kits with absorbent materials.
24. Appendix C, 11.2: Liquid waste should be stored in secondary containment, either per regulation, or as a BMP.
25. Appendix D: For each monitoring parameter, indicate the regulatory driver and whether this meets the regulatory criteria.