

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Superfund Records Center
SITE: Centredale
BREAK: 5-3
OTHER: 506551

FOR INCLUSION IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

November 14, 2011

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

Ms. Anna Krasko
On-Scene Coordinator, Region 1 EPA
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Mail Code: OSRR07-1
Boston, MA 02109-3912

Ms. Eve Stolov Vaudo, Esq.
Senior Enforcement Counsel, Region 1 EPA
5 Post Office Square
Mail Code OES04-4
Boston, MA 02109-3912

Re: Centredale Manor Restoration Project Superfund Site: Request for an Extension of the Public Comment Period Regarding the Proposed Remediation Action Plan, the Addendum to the Interim Final Feasibility Study, and the Addendum to the Interim Preliminary Remediation Goals Report: Oxbow Area

Dear Eve and Anna:

I am writing on behalf of Emhart Industries, Inc. ("Emhart") to request an extension of 120 days of the public comment period for the submission of comments concerning the Proposed Remediation Action Plan (dated October 2011) (the "PRAP"), the Addendum to the Interim Final Feasibility Study (dated September 2011) (the "IF/FS Addendum"), the Addendum to the Interim Preliminary Remediation Goals Report: Oxbow Area (dated September 2011) (the "PRG Addendum"), and other documentation in the Administrative Record ("AR") for the Centredale Manor Restoration Project Superfund Site (the "Site") related thereto. For the reasons set forth below, Emhart's requested extension is necessary to allow sufficient time for a full and thorough analysis of the PRAP, IF/FS Addendum, PRG Addendum, and AR by Emhart and other interested parties.



Ms. Anna Krasko
Ms. Eve Vaudo, Esq.
Page 2
November 14, 2011

First, EPA's proposed approach is complicated and controversial, both from a technical and a legal standpoint. This is witnessed by the fact that the AR contains in excess of 500 substantive documents, many of which were added within the last month or so.

Second, the IF/FS Addendum is 1,116 pages in length, and raises issues identified by EPA and the National Remedy Review Board that have only recently received attention from EPA. It simply is not reasonable to expect that Emhart and other interest parties will be able to digest and comment on such a lengthy document within the 60-day public comment period originally specified by EPA.

Third, despite the extensive length of the IF/FS Addendum, the PRAP, and the PRG Addendum, it is apparent that there are many substantive issues that still have not been adequately addressed. EPA's failure to address a number of key issues is exacerbated by the lack of critical data.

Fourth, the 60-day public comment period initially provided by EPA overlaps with at least two major religious holidays, Christmas and Hanukkah, and two major non-religious holidays, Thanksgiving and New Years. This further limitation on the extent of the public comment period simply is not reasonable.

Finally, a number of the interested parties who have actively engaged with EPA understood that the public comment period for the PRAP likely would be at least one year. EPA itself has acknowledged that the complexity of the site warrants a public comment period of significantly longer duration than is customary.

Please advise me at your earliest opportunity of EPA's response to this request.

Sincerely,


Jerome C. Muys, Jr.

Direct line: 202 370 3920
jmuys@sandw.com