EPA Proposes Changes to the Operable Unit 1 Cleanup Plan

Eastland Woolen Mill Superfund Site Corinna, Maine

Proposed Changes to the Groundwater Cleanup

Based on information collected during the design of the Operable Unit 1 (OU1) Remedial Action at the Eastland Woolen Mill Superfund Site, EPA is proposing one fundamental change and one minor change to the OU1 Remedial Action. The current OU1 cleanup approach was documented in the September 2002 Record of Decision (ROD).

- **The proposed fundamental change is the elimination of the long-term groundwater extraction and treatment system.**
- **The proposed minor change is the elimination of the co-solvent flushing technology.**

The proposed changes will reduce the overall cost of the cleanup action by over $7 million dollars without any decrease in the protection of public health and the environment.

In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (Section 117), the law that established the Superfund Program, this document summarizes EPA's revised cleanup proposal for OU 1 of the Eastland Woolen Mill Superfund Site. For detailed information on the options evaluated for use at the Site, see the Eastland Woolen Mill Focused Feasibility Study, which is available for review at the Site information repositories. The Site information repositories are located at the Stewart Public Library in Corinna, Maine and at EPA's Record Center at 1 Congress Street in Boston, MA. (See page 10 for more details.)

You are Invited to Attend:

A Public Information Meeting to learn more about the proposed changes to the OU1 cleanup plan followed by a Public Hearing, which is a Formal Comment Session to give citizens the opportunity to enter official comments for the public record about this proposal, will be held on:

May 25, 2006
7:00 p.m.
Corinna School Cafeteria
Stetson Road, Route 222,
Corinna, Maine

Your Opinion Counts!!

EPA is accepting public comment on this cleanup proposal from May 25 through June 26, 2006. You do not have to be a technical expert to comment. If you have a concern or preference regarding EPA=s proposal, EPA wants to hear from you before making a final decision on how to protect your community. To provide formal comments, you may:

Offer oral comments during the comment portion of the public information session on May 25, 2006 (see page 10 for details)

or

Send written comments postmarked no later than June 26, 2006 to:

Edward Hathaway, RPM
U.S. EPA Region I
1 Congress Street
Suite 1100 (HBT)
Boston, MA 02114-2023

or

E-mail comments by June 26, 2006 to:

hathaway.ed@epa.gov

For further information about this meeting, call EPA Community Involvement Coordinator Pam Harting-Barrat (617) 918-1318, or toll-free at 1-888-372-7341 ext. 81318.

Site History

- Eastland Woolen Mill operates as a wool and blended wool textile facility from 1909 to 1996.
- Liquid wastes from the Mill are discharged to the East Branch of the Sebasticook River until approximately 1969, when the local sewage treatment plant is built.
- Groundwater contamination is discovered in 1983. Carbon filters are installed on five contaminated wells. By 1988, ten water supplies are fitted with carbon filters.
- A water line is installed in 1995 to provide water for those properties with contaminated wells.
- Eastland Woolen Mill performs an investigation to assess the contamination from 1984 to 1995.
- Eastland Woolen Mill, Inc. ceases operations in 1996.
- Maine DEP removes 54,673 pounds of various hazardous substances from the closed mill in 1997.
- EPA begins investigation of the Eastland Woolen Mill site in December 1998.
- EPA places the Eastland Woolen Mill site on the National Priorities List (Superfund list) in July 1999.
- EPA signs an Action Memorandum to initiate a Non-Time-Critical Removal Action (NTCRA) in July 1999.
- EPA signs OU1 Record of Decision in September 2002 to address soil and groundwater contamination in downtown Corinna.
- EPA completes demolition of the mill and soil excavation and treatment program in 2003 as part of the NTCRA.
- EPA signs No Further Action Record of Decision for Operable Unit 2 (downstream portions of East Branch of Sebasticook River) in 2004.
- EPA performs in-situ application of reagents to remove contamination from groundwater, beginning in 2004.
- EPA completes design for OU1 Remedial Action in 2005.
- OU1 Remedial Action begins in September 2005 with installation of a water line connection.
- EPA issues a Focused Feasibility Study in May 2006 which documents the evaluation of proposed changes to the OU 1 Remedial Action.

Scope and Role of this Proposal

The intent of this proposal is to formally adopt a change to the OU1 ROD. The OU1 cleanup plan was described in the September 2002 Record of Decision. The OU1 Remedial Action was developed to be a comprehensive approach that addresses all current and potential future risks in the downtown Corinna area. The Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) identified the contaminated groundwater in the downtown Corinna area and the contaminated soils just above the bedrock as the only media at the Eastland Woolen Mill Site requiring remedial action after completion of the NTCRA. The OU1 portion of the Site is shown on Figure 1: Site Plan.

This proposal presents a recommended change to the OU1 ROD plan and seeks public comment regarding this change. As explained in more detail later in this document and in the Focused Feasibility Study for OU1, EPA is proposing to eliminate the long-term groundwater treatment system because the groundwater plume has shrunk and long-term active groundwater extraction and treatment is no longer necessary to prevent the expansion of the groundwater contamination or to prevent the discharge of contaminated groundwater to the East Branch of the Sebasticook River.

The other two components of the Eastland Woolen Mill Superfund Site are the Non-Time-Critical Removal Action (NTCRA) and the Operable Unit 2 (OU2) area. The NTCRA has successfully treated the majority of the contaminated soil at the Site. The treated soil is no longer acting as a source of contamination that could cause groundwater to exceed the cleanup levels specified in the OU1 ROD. Following the completion of the soil treatment program, the NTCRA targeted the use of in-situ chemical oxidation to eliminate contamination in two areas of soil contamination that were inaccessible to excavation and treatment. The NTCRA program will be completed in 2006.

EPA signed a No Further Action Record of Decision for the OU2 area of the Site in September 2004. The RI/FS revealed that the site contaminants in the OU2 area do not pose a risk to human health and the environment. The OU2 area included all of the sediment and floodplain areas downstream of the OU1 area, including the Old Dump. No further activities are planned for the OU2 area.

OU 1 Record of Decision Cleanup Plan

The original OU1 ROD was signed in September 2002 and included the following major components:

$ Extraction and treatment of the contaminated overburden and bedrock groundwater. The extraction system was intended to prevent off-site migration of contaminated groundwater and aid in the restoration of the aquifer to federal and state maximum contaminant levels (MCLs), federal non-zero maximum contaminant level goals (MCLGs), and more stringent State Maximum Exposure Guidelines (MEGs).

$ In-situ treatment of the contaminated overburden and bedrock groundwater and remaining areas of contaminated soil/DNAPL. A chemical reagent (e.g., persulfate) will be added to the overburden and bedrock aquifer to reduce the mass of contaminants in the system. If the mass reduction is not sufficient to achieve cleanup levels, then enhanced flushing (using surfactants and/or solvents) and biological degradation (using bio-stimulants) will be attempted to further reduce the mass of contamination.

$ Connection of certain residences to the water supply lines to prevent their wells from becoming contaminated and to prevent expansion of the contamination in the groundwater.

$ Implementation, monitoring and maintenance of institutional controls in the form of groundwater use restrictions (e.g., easements or restrictive covenants) to prevent ingestion of groundwater and disturbance of the groundwater extraction and treatment system.

$ Long-term monitoring of groundwater, surface water and sediments to evaluate the success of the Remedial Action.

$ Implementation of five-year reviews to assess the protectiveness of the remedy until cleanup goals have been met.

OU1 Remedial Action Update

During the past four years (2002 to 2006), the Remedial Design and ongoing NTCRA activities have resulted in the collection of a substantial amount of additional information to support the Remedial Design and to evaluate the success of the NTCRA and initial OU1 cleanup actions. The key findings from the Remedial Design investigations and the assessment of the NTCRA cleanup actions are:

- The NTCRA and OU1 Remedial Action have significantly reduced the extent of contaminated groundwater. The area of contaminated groundwater is now a small area beneath land that is currently undeveloped or is a public road.

- Since the extent of contaminated groundwater is shrinking, containment using extraction wells will no longer be necessary to prevent the groundwater contamination from expanding.

- The source contamination remaining after the NTCRA is limited to the deep overburden soil just above the bedrock, the weathered bedrock, and deep bedrock, as shown in Figures 2 and 3.

- Persulfate with an iron catalyst was selected as the oxidizing reagent for the on-going in-situ chemical oxidation (ISCO) program. The initial applications of the reagent have shown a substantial reduction in the contaminant mass.

- Groundwater discharging to the East Branch of the Sebasticook River (EBSR) no longer contains contamination at levels that will affect the ecological community (i.e., bugs that live in the river sediment).

- Groundwater modeling, in combination with groundwater monitoring, has enabled EPA to define the extent of the area where groundwater use restrictions will be necessary (Institutional Control Zone) and to finalize the list of properties that should be connected to the public water line. See Figure 4 for the Institutional Control Zone.

What impacts will the proposed change to the cleanup have on the community?

The most observable impact to the community will be the absence of a treatment plant that would have been present in downtown Corinna until the cleanup levels were met, in about 60 years. The elimination of the treatment plant will provide more space for the revitalization of downtown Corinna. The vehicle traffic and construction activity associated with the installation and long-term maintenance of the groundwater treatment plant will also be eliminated. A less observable effect, but not insignificant, is that the time period to restore the groundwater aquifer will be extended by approximately 20 years. The additional time does not in any way impact the local community, however, since public water is now supplied to all affected users and institutional controls are being put in place to prevent future use of the contaminated groundwater.

OU1 Cleanup Levels

The long-term goal of the OU1 Remedial Action is to restore the groundwater to meet all federal and state drinking water standards. The information collected to date does not suggest that any changes need to be made to these cleanup levels. The cleanup levels identified for the OU1 ROD will remain the same. The OU1 cleanup levels are presented in **Table 1.**

Table 1

Site Contaminants Of Concern in groundwater	Cleanup Level (ug/l or parts per billion)	Basis
Chlorobenzene	47	1992 MEG
1,2 Dichlorobenzene	85	1992 MEG
1,3 Dichlorobenzene	85	1992 MEG
1,4 Dichlorobenzene	27	1992 MEG
1,2,4 Trichlorobenzene	70	MCL
Benzene	5	MCL
Arsenic	10	MCL
Manganese	200	1992 MEG

MCL – Federal Maximum Contaminant Level established pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act.
MEG – State of Maine Maximum Exposure Guidelines for ingestion of groundwater.

OU I Remedial Action Objectives

Based upon the results of the Remedial Investigation, the Human Health Risk Assessment, and the Ecological Risk Assessment, EPA selected the following remedial action objectives for the 2002 OU1 cleanup action. The information collected to date does not suggest that any changes need to be made to these remedial action objectives. Therefore, the remedial action objectives below (from the 2002 Record of Decision) will apply to this cleanup proposal.

- Prevent the ingestion of groundwater containing contaminants that exceed federal or state MCLs, non-zero MCLGs, MEGs or, in their absence, an excess cancer risk of 1 x 10-6 or a hazard quotient of 1.
- Prevent, to the extent practicable, the off-site migration of groundwater with contamination above cleanup levels.
- Prevent, to the extent practicable, the discharge of groundwater with contamination above levels that could impact ecological receptors to the EBSR.
- Restore groundwater to meet federal or state MCls, non-zero MCLGs, MEGs, or, in their absence, an excess cancer risk of 1 x 10-6 or a hazard quotient of 1.
- Perform long-term monitoring of surface water, sediments, and groundwater to verify that the cleanup actions at the Site are protective of human health and the environment.

Cleanup Alternative Evaluation for the Proposed Changes to the OU1 Remedial Action

The Focused Feasibility Study for OU1 reviews the alternatives that EPA considered for this proposed change to the OU1 remedy. The original OU1 Remedial Action (GW-4), the proposed revised OU1 Remedial Action (GW-4a), and a No Further Action alternative will be presented and discussed in this plan.

During the upcoming comment period, EPA welcomes your comments on the proposed revision to the cleanup plan and other alternatives evaluated. Those alternatives are summarized below. Please consult the Focused Feasibility Study for more detailed information.

Limited or no action

Alternative GW-1: *No Further Action*

This alternative would result in the termination of the Remedial Action. EPA would leave the Site as it is and discontinue the OU1 cleanup activities.

Capital Costs: none
Present Worth of Long Term Monitoring: none

Alternative GW-4: *Hydraulic Containment with Contaminant Mass Reduction (Groundwater extraction with on-site treatment and in-situ reagent addition)*

This alternative is the OU1 Remedial Action selected in the 2002 Record of Decision. The major components of the OU1 Remedial Action are:

$ Extraction and treatment of the contaminated overburden and bedrock groundwater. The extraction system will be designed to prevent off-site migration of contaminated groundwater and to aid in the restoration of the aquifer to federal and state MCLs, federal non-zero MCLGs and more stringent State MEGs.

$ In-situ treatment of the contaminated overburden and bedrock groundwater and remaining areas of contaminated soil/DNAPL. A chemical reagent (persulfate) will be added to the overburden and bedrock aquifer to reduce the mass of contaminants in the system. If the mass reduction is not sufficient to achieve cleanup levels, then enhanced flushing (using surfactants and/or solvents) and biological degradation (using bio-stimulants) will be attempted to further reduce the mass of contamination.

$ Connection of certain residences to the water supply lines to prevent their wells from becoming contaminated and to prevent expansion of the contamination in the groundwater.

$ Implementation, monitoring and maintenance of institutional controls in the form of groundwater use restrictions (e.g., easements or restrictive covenants) to prevent ingestion of groundwater and disturbance of the groundwater extraction and treatment system.

$ Long-term monitoring of groundwater, surface water and sediments to evaluate the success of the remedial action.

$ Implementation of five-year reviews to assess the protectiveness of the remedy until cleanup goals have been met.

Capital Costs: $6.9 million
Total Present Value of Alternative GW-4: $12.5 million
Estimated time to achieve groundwater restoration: 60 years.

The OU1 GW-4 Remedial Action description has been updated from the 2002 ROD to reflect a more accurate cost estimate and length of time needed to achieve cleanup levels. In addition, EPA has selected persulfate as the reagent to be used in the in-situ treatment program.

Alternative GW-4a: *Contaminant Mass Reduction without Active Hydraulic Containment*

This alternative will revise the OU1 Remedial Action in two ways. It eliminates the long-term extraction and treatment of groundwater and it also eliminates the co-solvent flush of the bedrock fractures. No other changes are made to the OU1 remedy beyond updates to the cost and the time to achieve aquifer restoration.

The studies performed during the Remedial Design revealed that the long-term extraction and treatment of groundwater is no longer necessary to protect the East Branch of the Sebasticook River because the groundwater contamination plume has receded back toward the remaining source areas. This means that the contamination is no longer discharging to the river at concentrations that harm aquatic organisms. The Remedial Design concluded that the temporary groundwater extraction and treatment system, which is currently in place as a result of the NTCRA activities, could handle any hydraulic containment and treatment of groundwater necessary during the injection of chemicals.

The in-situ chemical oxidation pilot tests and full scale applications have shown that the in-situ chemical oxidation technology is a more cost-effective option for treating the bedrock contamination than the solvent flushing approach that was included as an option in the ROD. Therefore, the solvent flushing of the deep bedrock is not necessary and will not be included in the OU1 Remedial Action. Finally, given the reduction in the extent of the contaminated groundwater and the protection afforded by installing the water line connections, together with the additional safeguards of the institutional controls, there is no adverse consequence to human health or the environment as a result of adding 20 years to the period for achieving aquifer restoration.

EPA has therefore revised the OU1 Remedial Action cleanup approach, based on the information collected during the Remedial Design. EPA is proposing to remove the components of the cleanup that were no longer determined to be necessary to protect human health and the environment, resulting in a more cost-effective cleanup action.

The components of the cleanup action that are no longer necessary are:

- Construction of a long-term groundwater treatment facility;
- Long-term extraction and treatment of groundwater; and
- Use of a co-solvent flush.

All of the remaining components described in the OU1 Remedial Action will be implemented as described in the OU1 ROD and OU1 Remedial Design. These components include:

- In-situ chemical oxidation of the source material in the deep overburden and the shallow and deep bedrock (see Figures 2 and 3 for the locations of the in-situ program);
- Application of biostimulants after the in-situ chemical oxidation program;
- Connection of residences to the public water supply;
- Implementation of institutional controls to restrict future groundwater use (see Figure 4 for the institutional control zone);
- Long-term monitoring; and
- Five-Year Reviews

Capital costs: $3.54 million
Present Value of Alternative GW-4a: $4.8 million
Estimated time to achieve aquifer restoration: 80 years.

Maintenance and monitoring costs for years 1-5 are estimated at $95,000 per year. After year five, it is assumed that monitoring will only be performed to support the five-year reviews at an estimated cost of $104,000 every five years. EPA maintenance costs for the first ten years of operation and maintenance are estimated at $750,000 (present value). The MEDEP costs for the remaining years of maintenance and monitoring are estimated at $510,000 (present value).

Nine Criteria Evaluation

In accordance with the National Contingency Plan, remedial alternatives were evaluated according to nine evaluation criteria. The evaluation of the first seven of the nine NCP criteria was performed in detail in the Focused Feasibility Study.

Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment. This criterion assesses how well an alternative, as a whole, achieves and maintains protection of human health and the environment.

Compliance with ARARs. This criterion assesses how the alternative complies with location-specific, chemical-specific, and action-specific ARARs, and whether a waiver is required or justified.

Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence. This criterion evaluates the effectiveness of the alternative in protecting human health and the environment after response objectives have been met. This criterion includes consideration of the magnitude of residual risks and the adequacy and reliability of controls.

Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume through Treatment. This criterion evaluates the effectiveness of treatment processes used to reduce toxicity, mobility, and volume of hazardous substances. It also considers the degree to which treatment is irreversible, and the type and quantity of residuals remaining after treatment.

Short-term Effectiveness. This criterion examines the effectiveness of the alternative in protecting human health and the environment during the construction and implementation of a remedy until response objectives have been met. It also considers the protection of the community, workers, and environment during implementation of remedial actions.

Implementability. This criterion assesses the technical and administrative feasibility of an alternative and availability of required goods and services. Technical feasibility considers the ability to construct and operate a technology, its reliability, the ease of undertaking additional remedial actions, and the ability to monitor the effectiveness of a remedy. Administrative feasibility considers the ability to obtain approvals from other parties or agencies and the extent of required coordination with other parties or agencies.

Cost. This criterion evaluates the capital cost, as well as the operation and maintenance costs of each alternative. The present value of total costs is calculated to help compare costs among alternatives.

State Acceptance. This criterion considers the state's preferences among or concerns about the alternatives, including comments on ARARs or the proposed use of waivers. This criterion is addressed following state comments on the FFS and Proposed Plan.

Community Acceptance. This criterion considers the community's preferences among or concerns about the alternatives. This criterion is addressed following community comments on the FFS and Proposed Plan.

Summary of Comparative Analysis

As shown in Table 2, Alternative GW-1, No Action, would not be protective of human health and the environment and would not comply with ARARs. Therefore, GW-1 cannot be selected as the revised cleanup plan. Both GW-4 and GW-4a are protective of human health and the environment and would comply with ARARs. Both achieve long-term protection and permanence through the destruction of the contamination using treatment technologies. Both GW-4 and GW-4a would be implementable, have minimal short-term impacts, and achieve cleanup goals in a reasonable time frame. The only criteria which distinguishes between GW-4 and GW-4a is cost. GW-4a achieves all of the objectives of the OU I ROD for an estimated $3.4 million less in capital costs and $7.7 million less in the present value of total costs. The only advantage of GW-4 over GW-4a is that the estimated time period to achieve cleanup levels is slightly shorter, by 20 years. There is, however, no consequence to the increased time needed to complete the GW-4a for the following reasons: the extent of groundwater contamination is shrinking; the properties with contaminated groundwater have access to the public water supply; and land-use restrictions will prohibit the use of the contaminated groundwater. In addition, given the uncertainties associated with developing the estimated time to achieve cleanup levels, the difference in the time needed to complete GW-4 and GW-4a are negligible when the margin of error of the estimates is taken into account.

Table 2
Comparison of Groundwater Cleanup Alternatives

Nine Criteria	1 No Further Action	4 Hydraulic Containment and mass reduction using Groundwater extraction and treatment system with in-situ reagents	4a✱ Amended Mass reduction and aquifer restoration using in-situ reagents
Protects human health and environment	✗	✔	✔
Meets federal and State requirements	✗	✔	✔
Provides long-term protection	✗	✔	✔
Reduces mobility, toxicity and volume	✗	✔	✔
Provides short-term protection	✗	✔	✔
Implementable (Can it be done?)	✔	✔	✔
Cost: (Net Present Value):	$ 0	Capital Cost: $6.9 million Maintenance and monitoring: $12.5 million	Capital Cost: $3.5 million Maintenance and monitoring: $4.8 million
Time to reach cleanup goal	more than 600 years	60 years: significant reduction of contamination within 5 years if in-situ reagents are successful, 30 - 90 yrs for aquifer restoration	80 years: significant reduction of contamination within 5 years if in-situ reagents are successful, 30 - 90 yrs for aquifer restoration
State agency acceptance	*Evaluated after comment period*	*Evaluated after comment period*	*Evaluated after comment period*
Community acceptance	*Evaluated after comment period*	*Evaluated after comment period*	*Evaluated after comment period*

✱ EPA's preferred alternative
✔ Meets or exceeds criterion
✓ Partially meets criterion
✗ Does NOT meet criterion

Why Does EPA Recommend the Changes to the OU1 Cleanup Action described in this Proposed Plan?

After careful consideration of the original OU1 remedial action (alternative GW-4) and the proposed change to the OU1 remedy (GW-4a) and comparison of these alternatives with the nine evaluation criteria and against each other, EPA recommends GW-4a, the revised OU1 cleanup plan, as the best alternative for protection of public health and environment. The revised OU1 cleanup plan described in this Proposed Plan will meet all of the Remedial Action Objectives and cleanup levels established for the OU1 Remedial Action at a lower cost and with less disruption to the local community than the other alternatives over only a slightly longer time frame. Until cleanup levels are met, institutional controls will prohibit the use of contaminated groundwater. In addition, the residences and business whose wells could withdraw Site related contaminants have been connected to the public water supply, and the groundwater contamination currently resides in an area that is either under an existing roadway, designated as greenspace, or otherwise not available for development.

In summary, EPA recommends this proposed cleanup plan because, if implemented, the cleanup option would:

- *Meets 7 of the 9 criteria, including protection of public health and the environment and compliance with ARARs (Community input will be sought as part of this public comment period. EPA will also seek comments and concurrence from the State of Maine);*

- *Result in a permanent restoration of the groundwater in a reasonable time while protecting human health and the environment; and*

- *Provide the most cost-effective approach to Site cleanup through use of treatment technologies to reduce the toxicity, mobility, and volume of contamination.*

The revised cleanup plan also considers the Reuse Plan for the revitalization of downtown Corinna. The groundwater extraction and treatment plan included in the 2002 ROD would have reduced the available space for green space or commercial use. The revised cleanup plan, GW-4a, fully considers the input from the community regarding future reuse of the Site.

Long-term monitoring of surface water and groundwater will be performed until cleanup levels are attained. In addition, EPA will perform a review of the cleanup action every five years to ensure that the cleanup remains protective of human health and the environment. The first five-year review will occur in 2010.

Next Steps:

By the end of September 2006, EPA expects to have reviewed all comments and signed a ROD Amendment describing the revised cleanup plan. The amended ROD for OU1 and a summary of responses to public comments will be made available to the public at the Stewart Public Library and EPA Records Center in Boston. EPA will announce the decision to the community through the local news media and a general mailing.

EPA will also continue the groundwater remediation program at the Site for the components of the OU1 Remedial Action that are not subject to the proposed ROD Amendment. All construction and well installation activities associated with the OU1 Remedial Action are expected to be completed by September 2006. The in-situ oxidation program is expected to continue through 2007 and possibly 2008. EPA and Maine DEP anticipate completing the land use restrictions during that same period of time. After the completion of the in-situ oxidation program, EPA and Maine DEP will continue long-term monitoring of the Site.

How You Can Comment On EPA=s Proposal To Amend the OU 1 Cleanup Plan?

During the 30-day public comment period that begins on May 25, 2006 and ends on June 26, 2006, EPA will accept comments on the proposed changes to the OU1 Remedial Action. EPA will hold a public hearing on May 25, 2006 to provide an opportunity for the public to speak their comments into the official record. EPA uses this public input to improve the cleanup proposal. Your formal input and ideas will become part of the Administrative Record. The transcript of oral comments and EPA's written responses to oral and written comments will be issued in a document called a Responsiveness Summary**,** which is included in the ROD Amendment. Once complete, the Responsiveness Summary will be available at the Stewart Public Library for review. There are three different ways in which individuals can express their comments on this Proposed Plan

- Comments can be submitted in writing to EPA before June 26, 2006.
- Comments can be sent to the EPA Remedial Project Manager by email to:hathaway.ed@epa.gov by June 26, 2006.
- Comments can be spoken into the official public record during the public hearing that will occur as part of the public meeting on May 25, 2006.

EPA encourages anyone with a concern or who favors the cleanup to express his or her opinion during the comment period. All comments are welcome. Any of the three mechanisms above are acceptable for providing comments, and all of the comments are given equal weight.

There will be two parts to the combined public informational meeting and public hearing. The first part of the combined meeting will be an informational session to explain the proposed cleanup and answer questions informally. Comments that are made during this meeting will not be part of the Aofficial record.@ This meeting will focus on a discussion of the Proposed Plan and Focused Feasibility Study and is considered informational only. The second part of the meeting, a public hearing, will provide an opportunity for the public to speak its comments into the official record. A stenographer will be present to record all of the comments offered during this public hearing. Time for comments will be limited in order to allow all individuals present to have an opportunity to speak their comments into the record. EPA does not respond to any of the comments made at the hearing other than to indicate the time limits or request clarification. At the close of the formal comment session, if time permits, EPA will be available to answer questions, again informally.

The comment period will last for thirty days unless an extension is requested. Once the comment period is complete, EPA will assemble and evaluate all of the submitted comments. Appropriate revisions to the proposal to amend the OU1 ROD will be made based on these comments. EPA will then sign the amendment to the OU1 Record of Decision, if appropriate. The ROD Amendment and a summary of responses to public comments will become part of the Administrative Record for OU1 and will be made available to the public at the Stewart Public Library and the EPA Records Center in Boston.

For More Information about the Cleanup:

All of the technical and public information publications prepared to date for the site are available for public review at the following locations:

EPA Records Center
1 Congress Street, Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114-2023
(617) 918-1453
Hours: 10:00 a.m.-noon, 2:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

Stewart Public Library
8 Levi Stewart Drive
Corinna, Maine 04928

A copy of all of the major reports for the Eastland Woolen Mill are also available at the Maine DEP Offices in Augusta, Maine. Call (207) 287-7843 if you want to access the files at the Bureau of Remediation and Waste Management of the ME DEP.

Use This Space to Write Your Comments

or to be added to the mailing list

EPA encourages you to provide your written comments and ideas about the cleanup options under consideration for dealing with the contamination at the Eastland Woolen Mill Superfund Site. You can use the form below to send written comments. If you have questions about how to comment, please call **EPA Community Involvement Coordinator Pam Harting-Barrat at 617.918.1318.** Please mail this form or additional sheets of written comments, postmarked no later than June 26, 2006 to:

Edward Hathaway
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region I, (HBT)
1 Congress Street, Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114 - 2023
or E-Mail to: hathaway.ed@epa.gov

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(Attach sheets as needed)
Comment Submitted by:

Mailing list additions, deletions or changes

If you did not receive this through the mail and would like to

❒ be added to the site mailing list
❒ note a change of address
❒ be deleted from the mailing list

Name :_____
Address:_____
_____
_____

Please check the appropriate box and fill in the correct address information above.

Eastland Woolen Mill Superfund Site
Public Comment Sheet (cont....)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Fold, staple, stamp, and mail----------

_____
_____
_____

Place
Stamp
Here

Edward Hathaway
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region I (HBT)
1 Congress Street, Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114 -2023