

To: mdevans@efdnorth.navfac.navy.mil
Cc:
Bcc:
From: KYMBERLEE KECKLER <KECKLER.KYMBERLEE@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV>
Subject: Thames follow-up
Date: Wednesday, April 26, 1995 18:57:39 EDT
Attach: Headers.822
Certify: N
Forwarded by:

Mark -

I just spoke with Patti about the four outstanding issues on the letter given to you on April 26, 1995 about the ecological sampling in the Thames River. They are discussed below in the order that they appear on Attachment A to that letter.

p. 1-2 - Downstream location in the report is ok. The sample that we added north of Pier 32 (near outfall from Building 174) satisfies this comment. I think that makes a total of 11 samples.

p. 2-4 - What we discussed at the meeting was correct. I think what we said and what the report meant to say are the same thing. The text should state that the upstream reference could be contaminated by sources other than the NSB. HNUS may wish to edit the report to make it a bit clearer.

both comments re: p. 2-8 - You still need to analyze mercury, antimony, and chromium - but they should not be used with the formulae referenced in these comments. Double check the reference cited here.

p. 3-4 - Only one sample is needed at the reference site, not nine. Something must have gotten lost in the translation between Kathy Trapp and the report writer.

Please relay these to Corey Rich. Have him call ME (not Patti) with any questions. I sincerely hope that HNUS will address these issues ASAP so that they can get an approved work plan and then collect the sediment samples on May 1, 1995.

Talk with you soon,
K2