

58848

NUTTER, McCLENNEN & FISH

FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02210

BOSTON OFFICE

TELEPHONE (617) 973 9700
TELEX 940790
TELECOPIER (617) 973-9748
CABLE ADDRESS "DUNTER"

WASHINGTON, D.C. OFFICE

FEDERAL BAR BUILDING WEST
1819 H STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
TELEPHONE (202) 296-3500

December 6, 1984
11478-26

Charles C. Bering, Esquire
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region I
JFK Federal Building
Boston, MA 02203

RECEIVED

DEC 11 1984

RE: New Bedford Harbor

REGION I
OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL

Dear Mr. Bering:

In addition to the information requested by Mr. Galvani on behalf of the defense group in his letter to you of November 21, 1984, we would like to ask NUS to address the following questions and/or provide the following information so that AVX Corporation may prepare to file its comments on the RI/FS.

1. One feature common to a number of the alternatives set forth in the draft FS is a sediment control structure. It would be helpful to have any information NUS has with respect to the design basis of the sediment control structure they propose.
2. During the meeting on November 15, NUS stated that it had rejected alternatives such as in situ stabilization, a sheet pile sediment disposal structure, a geofabric cover, sediment stabilization, and biodegradation remedial options. What studies or information did NUS have available to it in considering these alternatives? If such information was not available, what was the basis for NUS rejection of these alternatives?
3. Also in the November 15 meeting, NUS stated that it had rejected the western shore as a location for an in-harbor containment area. On what information and data did NUS base its selection of the eastern shore as the location for such a containment area?
4. What data does NUS have with respect to hydrodynamics (water speed, direction, rate of flow, salt water/fresh water interface, etc.) of the New Bedford Harbor and Acushnet River in the area of the harbor.

NUTTER, MCCLENNEN & FISH

Charles C. Bering, Esquire
December 6, 1984
Page Two

5. What studies or reports were used by NUS to determine its foundation design for the proposed earthen embankments?

6. With respect to each of the proposed NUS alternatives, what flood routing calculation has NUS used?

7. What is the size, nature and location of all effluent discharge lines in the upper estuary? Also, on a related subject, please advise when the undisclosed source study, RAMP Project 006, will be complete and available?

8. The following data will be helpful in analyzing the draft FS. If it has already been made available by way of the Metcalf & Eddy data tape, then we would repeat Paul Galvani's request for the detailed computer program and computer application information so as to permit analysis and manipulation of the Metcalf & Eddy data base:

(a) All boring logs describing sub-surface conditions in the Acushnet River estuary; and

(b) Results of all engineering tests performed on soil samples obtained from the Acushnet River estuary.

9. We would also like to review all proposals submitted to the EPA to perform the RAMP project 007 Transport/Pathways Study.

*Pre-CALC
Review book
COE*

10. Finally, as a result of our November 15 meeting, we would expect to receive the draft of the USCG/ERT study which provides data concerning the alleged transport of 2,000 pounds per year of PCB. If there is any additional description of the source and fate of this migration material, review of such material will be essential to understanding this critical aspect of the draft FS.

Very truly yours,

Mary Ryan

Mary K. Ryan

MKR:jk

cc: Ralph A. Child, Esquire
Lee Breckenridge, Esquire
Bradford Gentry, Esquire
John Stevens, Esquire
David A. McLaughlin, Esquire
John Quarles, Esquire
Paul B. Galvani, Esquire