

**O'CONNOR SUPERFUND SITE**  
**OPERABLE UNIT-2**  
**September 2002 ROD AMENDMENT**

**APPENDIX A - RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY**

**Comments Received on the June 2002 Proposed Plan for the O'Connor Site**

1. Comments from Community Members

No comments were received from the community during the July 9, 2002 hearing for the Proposed Plan.

Several comments were voiced during the information meeting held on June 24, 2002 and are summarized below.

Community member: In discussing the technical impracticability of removing the oil, different technologies were suggested which should perhaps be considered to clean up the residual oil.

EPA's Response: Although these suggestions, including the controlled blasting of the bedrock as would be done in a quarry operation, were not looked at in the TI evaluation, EPA believes the difficulties posed by the geology and hydrology of the site would be the same as for any of the eighteen technologies considered in the TI. These limitations include:

- residual oil tied up in fractures in the clayey soils and in the bedrock;
- limited groundwater recharge to the source area so that there is limited flushing; and
- the relatively impermeable clay limits the effectiveness of in-situ application of oxidizing agents or other compounds.

The possibility of further excavation of the soil with the residual oil was evaluated as part of the TI process. In a way, it posed a similar question that would be asked for removal of the bedrock: how would the limits of excavation (or blasting) be determined? The source control effort showed through extensive testing that the cleanup standards for the soils were met. In many cases, the results were below the laboratory detection limit. So with the soils already below the detection limit, sampling would not provide a method to determine the extent of any excavation (or blasting). EPA believes this would lead to arbitrary excavation and hence it would be difficult to implement, difficult to estimate costs, and difficult to provide an approach to assess its effectiveness. Consequently, this alternative was screened out during the TI evaluation.

Community member: Several comments were made that the nine criteria used in selecting a remedy needed to be expanded to ten, to look at the impact of a Superfund site on property values. Additionally, there was the desire that EPA direct the City of Augusta to provide tax relief for the surrounding properties.

EPA's Response: EPA is aware of concerns raised at this site regarding the impact of having a Superfund site as a neighbor - this is a concern heard across the country. EPA has made changes in its policies regarding its approach to adjacent properties where contamination has come to be located, and EPA has studied the economic impact of Superfund sites on property values, but as pointed out by Maine DEP at the public meeting, the Superfund law does not provide for any method to address this issue. This issue may be more properly addressed on the state and local levels. However, EPA hopes that by addressing the problems at the Site in a way that protects human health and the environment in the long term there will ultimately be a positive impact in the community.

Community member: Several long-time community members asked about the impact on Riggs Brook, tying in their recollections of oil being visible in the brook and far downstream of the site. In addition, questions were asked regarding the appropriateness of sampling fish when perhaps other organisms might provide a better indication of PCB-contamination

EPA's Response: EPA acknowledges that conditions at the O'Connor property impacted other areas, such as Riggs Brook. However, the current data has indicated that the PCB concentrations are quite low where groundwater discharge to Riggs Brook is occurring and that there does not appear to be any more overland transport from the source area to Riggs Brook.

Monitoring well MW-106B is a bedrock well located in the Riggs Brook wetlands and is a flowing artesian well - that is, water flows out of the well head at the ground surface. Sampling for the past several years have shown low levels of contamination which are below the ROD performance standards. Yearly sediment sampling has indicated that PCB concentrations are typically below the trigger level of 5 ppm and often below the clean up goal of 1 ppm. Analysis of the data suggests that the concentrations in both groundwater and sediment are decreasing and EPA anticipates that the concentrations will continue to decrease following the source control remedial action.

The use of fish rather than other organisms as an indicator of PCBs was determined at the time of the 1989 ROD. Personnel from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), as natural resource trustees, were involved with this aspect of the remedy selection. As they are the individuals with the expertise in this field, selection of fish was based on their knowledge of PCB bioaccumulation. Personnel from USFWS continue to be involved with the Riggs Brook monitoring as well as EPA and Maine DEP ecological risk assessors. It is noted that several species of fish have been collected as part of the monitoring program.

Community member: Concern was raised about the prospect that contaminated groundwater may

pass beyond the CMP property to potentially impact other properties.

EPA's Response: The highest priority in selecting a remedy is to ensure that it is protective of human health as well as the environment. With the acknowledgment that it is technically impracticable to clean up the groundwater beneath a portion of the site, EPA must select a remedy that prevents further migration of the contamination, and Maine DEP strongly agrees with this. EPA believes the selected remedy does this. Concentrations at monitoring wells MW-106A and MW-106B, located in the Riggs Brook wetlands, plus the wells downgradient of the TWA-II area have been meeting the performance standards set in the ROD for the past several years. EPA believes that the groundwater system has reached equilibrium and that contamination will not move beyond the CMP property. However, should the concentrations change in these wells, and residential wells be installed in adjacent properties, then EPA would have these wells tested.

## 2. Comments from Maine Department of Environmental Protection

At the hearing for the Proposed Plan, Maine DEP entered a statement into the site record. The State noted the following concerns and stated that their concurrence on the ROD amendment was contingent on these concerns being addressed.

Maine DEP: USEPA must better identify and define the criteria for discontinuing use of the VER system.

EPA's Response: In the Proposed Plan, EPA stated the active recovery of oil using the VER would continue on an annual basis as long as it was practical. This ROD amendment provides more detail regarding the VER application. It sets forth a framework under which the VER will operate, states that it will be operated for the next five years, and that the reevaluation of its operation will be tied in with the next five-year review scheduled for summer 2007.

Maine DEP: All site work will be performed in compliance with the revised cleanup plan and all applicable standard operating procedures, laws, and regulations.

EPA's Response: All work performed onsite will follow approved work plans and all applicable requirements.

Maine DEP: MEDEP will be given at least 2 weeks notice prior to each sampling event.

EPA's Response: This will be addressed in any enforcement agreement that is entered into to conduct the remedy selected in this ROD Amendment.

Maine DEP: It must be periodically demonstrated that there is a continuous twelve inches of clean soil over the Designated Area. The details of such demonstration will be established prior

to the finalization of the ROD Amendment.

EPA's Response: As part of the change in the soil remedy, as documented in the 1994 ESD, twelve inches of clean soil were to be placed over the designated area. This soil, defined as containing less than one ppm of PCBs, was to be brought in from offsite. Concurrent with the ESD, Maine DEP and CMP signed a Restrictive Covenant which states that CMP or subsequent owner "shall maintain all drainage ways... permeable or impervious caps or covers (including areas covered by topsoil or other clean fill)"

EPA agreed to address this issue concurrently with the TI evaluation. As noted in Section IV. Scope and Role of Operable Unit, of this ROD Amendment, operation and maintenance will include provisions for periodic monitoring of the soil cover as well as random sampling of the surface soils to be performed at the time of the five-year reviews. Maine DEP indicated this was an acceptable resolution for this issue.

Maine DEP: Clarify, by incorporation into the ROD Amendment, that the clean up goal for PCBs in sediment is actually 1 ppm, not 5 ppm. However, MEDEP agrees that the 5 ppm trigger level for remedial action is acceptable.

EPA's Response: EPA has clarified in Section IV. Scope and Role of Operable Unit of this ROD amendment that the clean up goal for PCBs in Riggs Brook and associated wetland sediments is 1 ppm.

A review of the 1991 Consent Decree and the 1994 Revised Statement of Work found that neither document provides any criteria to define a hot spot excavation. Similarly, the approved October 1997 Final Riggs Brook Sediment and Biota Sampling and Analysis Plan is also silent on this issue. To clarify this, the clean up goal for Riggs Brook and associated wetland sediment is 1 ppm, but should a hot spot excavation occur, the extent of that excavation would be to less than 5 ppm.

This is consistent with the intent of the 1989 ROD to protect ecological receptors. As noted in the 1989 ROD, in addition to the clean up goal for sediments, the trigger for additional sampling is also tied to the goal of less than 2 ppm for PCBs in fish tissue samples. Should this sampling indicate greater than 2 ppm "then a more rigorous sampling effort of such contamination will be conducted to determine the need for and/or extent of further remedial action to be undertaken within Riggs Brook, if any". (1989 ROD, page 47)

Maine DEP: All significant erosion occurring in the Designated Area on site will be addressed in a timely manner to prevent exposure to levels of PCB above 1 ppm and lead above 248 ppm.

EPA's Response: See the response above regarding maintenance of the soil cover.

#### •Comments from the Settling Party

Central Maine Power Co. (CMP) provided comments during the public comment period for the

site record in response to two of Maine DEP's comments. CMP noted it supports the amended ROD for the O'Connor site.

CMP: Cover Soil Effectiveness. The Source Control Remedial Action (SCRA) required that a 12-inch cover of soil containing less than 1 ppm of PCBs be placed over the Designated Area, the portion of the site where residual PCB concentrations in the soil could be up to 10 ppm. That cover soil was placed during SCRA, and a cover crop of vegetation was established to stabilize the soil and control erosion. The operating plan requires periodic inspections of the site by CMP to identify any areas of erosion, and remedial action to be taken to repair those areas. To address the concern that long-term gradual erosion could reduce the thickness of soil cover in some areas without being visually obvious, discussions were held with Maine DEP and EPA to develop a sampling program for the soil cover.

EPA's Response: As stated above, operation and maintenance will include confirmatory sampling of the soil cover coincident with the five-year reviews for the site. Ten locations will be randomly generated for sampling, using the grid nodes from the SCRA. Composite samples from 4 - 8" below grade will be collected and analyzed for PCBs. Should the results be above 1 ppm, EPA, Maine DEP, and CMP will determine appropriate steps to take.

CMP: Riggs Brook PCB Concentrations. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) evaluation of Riggs Brook discussed in the 1989 ROD suggested a target cleanup level for PCBs of 1 ppm. However, the ROD selected a remedy for the site that allowed the existing maximum of 5 ppm PCBs in the sediment to remain because the short-term impacts of excavation would be more damaging to the wetland area. The selected remedy required that a 10-year monitoring program be instituted, and that a more rigorous sampling effort be undertaken if sampling found sediment values above 5 ppm or fish tissue samples above 2 ppm. The results of this more rigorous sampling would be used to determine if additional remediation of Riggs Brook were to be required. Because excavation in Riggs Brook could cause short-term damage to the ecosystem, as recognized by the ROD, CMP believes the limits of any remediation should be established with respect to meeting the 5 ppm target level for PCBs, and not necessarily the 1 ppm target suggested by USFWS if doing so creates an unacceptable short-term impact to Riggs Brook.

EPA's Response: EPA agrees that the limit of any excavation based on an exceedance of 5 ppm would be to get below 5 ppm. However, the possibility exists that the levels identified in fish tissue sampling could be greater than 2 ppm yet the sediment data be below 5 ppm. Should such a situation arise, then the triggering of further sampling with possible remedial actions is appropriate.

**O'CONNOR SUPERFUND SITE**  
**OPERABLE UNIT 2**  
**September 2002 ROD AMENDMENT**

**APPENDIX B- ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX**

4. FEASIBILITY STUDY (FS)

1. FACT SHEET: EPA PROPOSES TO AMEND THE CLEAN-UP PLAN FOR THE F. O'CONNOR SUPERFUND SITE.

AUTHOR: US EPA REGION 1

DOC ID: 32499      06/01/2002      15 PAGES

2. REPORT: TECHNICAL IMPRACTICABILITY EVALUATION FOR OU-2 MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION (WITH TRANSMITTAL) [1 OF 2].

TO:    CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31877      06/01/2002      135 PAGES

3. REPORT: TECHNICAL IMPRACTICABILITY EVALUATION FOR OU-2 MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION, APPENDICES [2 OF 2].

TO:    CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31881      06/01/2002      303 PAGES

6. REMEDIAL DESIGN (RD)

1. REPORT: MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOATING FREE PRODUCT OIL STUDY.

AUTHOR: ALTON P. DAVIS, GEI CONSULTANTS INC

          JOANNE O. MORIN, GEI CONSULTANTS INC

          MURIEL S. ROBINETTE, GEI CONSULTANTS INC

DOC ID: 31925      02/14/1993      79 PAGES

2. REPORT: REMEDIAL DESIGN/REMEDIAL ACTION REVISED STATEMENT OF WORK.

AUTHOR: US EPA

DOC ID: 32078      10/20/1994      50 PAGES

3. REPORT: MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION GROUNDWATER MONITORING PROGRAM SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN, VOLUME I OF II.

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31933      12/01/1996      156 PAGES

4. LETTER: AMENDMENTS TO THE MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN.

TO: ERIN HESKETT, US EPA REGION 1

AUTHOR: JAMES M. MOODY, WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31953      03/14/2000      10 PAGES

7. REMEDIAL ACTION (RA)

1. REPORT: VACUUM ENHANCED RECOVERY PILOT TEST, PHASE 1 INSTALLATION AND OPERATION REPORT (WITH TRANSMITTAL).

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31937      12/01/1996      126 PAGES

2. REPORT: DATA COLLECTION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE PHASE 2 OPERATION OF THE VACUUM ENHANCED RECOVERY (VER) SYSTEM AT THE O'CONNOR SITE IN AUGUSTA, MAINE.

TO: ROSS GILLELAND, US EPA REGION 1

AUTHOR: ERIC T CARLSON, WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31948      06/27/1997      33 PAGES

3. REPORT: MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION.

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31957      08/01/1997      185 PAGES

4. MEMO: FINAL INSPECTION OF THE SOURCE CONTROL REMEDIAL ACTION.

TO: MARY JANE O'DONNELL, US EPA REGION 1

AUTHOR: ROSS GILLELAND, US EPA REGION 1

DOC ID: 31996      12/01/1997      2 PAGES

5. REPORT: WETLAND CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT.

TO:    CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: SMART ASSOCIATES

DOC ID: 31992      03/12/1998      49 PAGES

6. REPORT: FINAL SOURCE CONTROL REMEDIAL ACTION REPORT [1 of 2].

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31985      09/01/1998      421 PAGES

7. REPORT: FINAL SOURCE CONTROL REMEDIAL ACTION REPORT [2 of 2].

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31991      09/01/1998      358 PAGES

8. LETTER: OIL STUDY IN THE UPLAND MARSH AREA AT THE CMP O'CONNOR SITE.

TO:    ROY KOSTER, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: ERIC T CARLSON, WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 31997      01/26/1999      19 PAGES

9. REPORT: 1998 WETLAND CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT.

TO:    CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: SMART ASSOCIATES

DOC ID: 32028      04/08/1999      31 PAGES

10. REPORT: 1999 RIGGS BROOK SEDIMENT MONITORING REPORT.

TO:    ROY KOSTER, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: HENRI J. VINCENT, WOODARD & CURRAN INC

DOC ID: 32059      02/01/2000      103 PAGES

11. REPORT: 1999 WETLAND CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT.

TO:    CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: SMART ASSOCIATES

DOC ID: 32024      08/15/2000      39 PAGES

12. LETTER: COMMENTS ON 1999 WETLAND CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT (DATED AUG 15, 2000).

TO: CORNELL ROSIU, US EPA REGION 1  
ERIN HESKETT, US EPA REGION 1  
AUTHOR: STEVEN E MIERZYKOWSKI, US DOI/US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE  
DOC ID: 32022 10/19/2000 5 PAGES

13. REPORT: 2000 WETLAND CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT.

TO: CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY  
AUTHOR: SMART ASSOCIATES  
DOC ID: 32020 03/13/2001 43 PAGES

14. LETTER: COMMENTS ON 2000 WETLAND CONSTRUCTION MONITORING REPORT (DATED MARCH 13, 2001).

TO: CORNELL ROSIU, US EPA REGION 1  
TERRENCE R CONNELLY, US EPA REGION 1  
AUTHOR: STEVEN E MIERZYKOWSKI, US DOI/US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE  
DOC ID: 32012 06/29/2001 4 PAGES

15. REPORT: DRAFT 2000 RIGGS BROOK SEDIMENT AND BIOTA MONITORING REPORT.

TO: ROY KOSTER, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY  
AUTHOR: HENRI J. VINCENT, WOODARD & CURRAN INC  
DOC ID: 32058 07/01/2001 159 PAGES

16. REPORT: REVISED LONG-TERM GROUNDWATER QUALITY MONITORING PROGRAM AND PHASE III VACUUM ENHANCED RECOVERY OF OIL WORK PLAN.

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC  
DOC ID: 32061 07/01/2001 28 PAGES

17. REPORT: MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION, SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC  
DOC ID: 32066 10/01/2001 112 PAGES

18. REPORT: DRAFT 2001 RIGGS BROOK SEDIMENT MONITORING REPORT.

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC  
DOC ID: 32062 12/01/2001 118 PAGES

19. REPORT: DRAFT VER PHASE III REPORT.

AUTHOR: WOODARD & CURRAN INC  
DOC ID: 32069 12/01/2001 28 PAGES

20. LETTER: COMMENTS ON DRAFT VER PHASE III REPORT.

TO: TERRENCE R CONNELLY, US EPA REGION 1

AUTHOR: WILKES B HARPER, ME DEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

DOC ID: 32072 02/16/2002 2 PAGES

10. ENFORCEMENT/NEGOTIATION

1. LITIGATION: CONSENT DECREE, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, V.

CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY, DEFENDENT.

TO: JOE C. COLLIER, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

AUTHOR: CYNTHIA S HUBER, US DEPT OF JUSTICE

ELISSA TONKIN, US EPA REGION 1

JULIE BELAGA, US EPA REGION 1

RICHARD B STEWART, US DEPT OF JUSTICE

DOC ID: 32075 07/26/1990 80 PAGES

13. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

1. FACT SHEET: O'CONNOR COMPANY MAINE, EPA ID# MED980731475.

AUTHOR: US EPA REGION 1

DOC ID: 32080 01/01/1996 3 PAGES

2. LETTER: LETTER TO NEIGHBORS/ABUTTERS OUTLINING THE CONTINGENCY REMEDY

WITH A QUESTIONNAIRE AND 'FACTS AT A GLANCE SHEET' [INCLUDING FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET].

AUTHOR: ROY LANE, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

DOC ID: 32083 03/26/1996 6 PAGES

3. MEMO : RESPONSES TO MARCH 22, 1996 NEIGHBOR/ABUTTER QUESTIONNAIRE.

TO: ROSS GILLELAND, US EPA REGION 1

AUTHOR: TERENCE R. PEACOCK, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

DOC ID: 32085 06/10/1996 26 PAGES

4. LETTER: UPDATE ON COMMUNITY RELATIONS.

TO: KATHLEEN B. FULLER, AUGUSTA (ME), CITY OF

AUTHOR: ROY LANE, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

DOC ID: 31998      07/10/1996      2 PAGES

5. PUBLIC MEETING RECORD: SUMMARY OF CLEANUP ACTIVITY, PREPARED FOR SITE NEIGHBORS AND ABUTTING LANDOWNERS.

AUTHOR: ROY LANE, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

DOC ID: 32000      07/24/1996      10 PAGES

6. PUBLIC MEETING RECORD: PUBLIC MEETING, AMERICAN LEGION POST 205, AGENDA.

AUTHOR: ROY LANE, CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

DOC ID: 32002      12/12/1996      12 PAGES

7. NEWS CLIPPING: EPA TESTS CONY ROAD HOMES.

AUTHOR: DAVE CHEEVER, KENNEBEC JOURNAL

DOC ID: 32004      06/26/1997      2 PAGES

8. NEWS CLIPPING: CITY JUNKYARD OFFICIALLY CLEAN.

AUTHOR: GARY J. REMAL, KENNEBEC JOURNAL

DOC ID: 32005      11/13/1997      2 PAGES

9. NEWS CLIPPING: WEEKLY UPDATE, O'CONNOR SUPERFUND CLEAN-UP CELEBRATED.

AUTHOR: CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY

DOC ID: 32006      11/20/1997      2 PAGES

10. FACT SHEET: EPA TO REVIEW PROGRESS OF CLEANUP AT O'CONNOR SUPERFUND SITE.

AUTHOR: ALICE KAUFMAN, US EPA REGION 1

DOC ID: 32008      05/08/2002      2 PAGES

## 20. RECORDS MANAGEMENT

1. LIST : LIST OF GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS.

AUTHOR: US EPA REGION 1

DOC ID: 32519      06/20/2002      1 PAGE

**O'CONNOR SUPERFUND SITE**  
**OPERABLE UNIT 2**  
**September 2002 ROD AMENDMENT**

**APPENDIX C - STATE CONCURRENCE LETTER**



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

ANGUS S. KING, JR.  
GOVERNOR

MARTHA KIRKPATRICK  
COMMISSIONER

September 19, 2002

Mr. Richard Cavagnero  
Acting Director – Office of Site Remediation and Restoration  
US EPA  
One Congress Street - Suite 1100 (HBT)  
Boston, MA. 02114-2023

Regarding: O'Connor Junkyard Superfund Site  
(F. O'Connor Company Superfund Site)  
Augusta, Maine

Dear Mr. Cavagnero,

The Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP) has completed its review of the Record of Decision Amendment – Operable Unit 2 – for the F. O'Connor Company Superfund Site (Site) in Augusta, Maine dated September 2002.

Based on this review the MEDEP is pleased to provide its concurrence on, with caveats, the revised remedy selected for OU-2. This remedy relies on active and passive oil recovery, long term monitoring of the groundwater, and land use restrictions specified in a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants recorded at the Kennebec County Registry of Deeds on September 13, 2002 – Book 7058, page 42.

This concurrence is contingent upon the following caveats:

1. *Finalize an Operations and Maintenance Plan (O&M).*

The O&M must be finalized to the satisfaction of the MEDEP within a reasonable time frame following our concurrence with the ROD Amendment.

A draft O&M was submitted to MEDEP on June 6, 2002 by Woodard and Curran (W&C) on behalf of Central Maine Power Company (CMP). This plan failed to address the monitoring and maintenance requirements regarding the clean soil cover overlying the Designated Area (DA); therefore, it was rejected by MEDEP. The Designated Area is a subsection of the property where soils contaminated with up to 10 parts per million (ppm) of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and 248 ppm lead were left on site.

During a meeting August 14, 2002 held onsite between representatives of CMP, W&C, and MEDEP, it was unanimously agreed that the draft O&M will be revised to include provisions for periodic monitoring and maintenance of the DA cover. Specifically, sampling of the DA cover will be performed to coincide with each 5 Year Review process beginning in 2007. A total of 10 sampling points will be chosen randomly for each sampling event. Discrete soil samples will be collected from 4" to 8" below the surface of the DA and analyzed for PCBs. MEDEP will be given at least 2 weeks notice prior to each sampling event.

AUGUSTA  
17 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017  
(207) 287-7688  
RAY BLDG., HOSPITAL ST.

BANGOR  
106 HOGAN ROAD  
BANGOR, MAINE 04401  
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND  
312 CANCO ROAD  
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103  
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE  
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK  
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769-2094  
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 764-1507

2. *Establish Criteria for Termination of the Vacuum Enhanced Recovery System (VER)*

Based on the site conceptual model, residual oil remains onsite trapped in the clay layers between the overburden and bedrock. Additional oil may be present trapped in the bedrock fractures. The amount of this residual oil is unknown; however, it is understood that any reduction in the overall quantity of oil remaining on site will have a beneficial effect on groundwater quality.

The VER system was first used in 1996. Since then approximately 85 gallons of PCB-contaminated oil has been recovered through the use of this system. However, criteria for continued use or termination of this system has never been adequately defined.

MEDEP, following discussions with EPA, requires that as long as a significant amount of oil can be recovered using the VER system, then operation of the VER will continue. A significant amount of oil is defined as an increase in the amount of oil recovered relative to the amount recovered through passive methods using absorbent materials. This means that if the VER system is effectively increasing the amount of oil being passively recovered from a particular well, it will continue to be applied to that well.

Use of the VER will continue to be used annually until at least the next Five Year Review process (i.e. 2007). An evaluation will be made at that time to determine if further use of the VER is still warranted.

3. *Continued Adherence to the Existing Long Term Monitoring Program*

The O&M also includes a long term monitoring plan requiring bi-annual groundwater sampling on selected wells. Samples from these wells will be analyzed for PCBs and volatile organic compounds. This information will be used to evaluate whether the remedy is successful.

Such long term monitoring will continue as long as the groundwater fails to attain all applicable standards.

4. *Consideration of Contingencies in Case the Selected Remedy is Not Successful*

In the event the provisions of the selected remedy are not successful, remedial contingency plans must be considered and implemented as appropriate.

The MEDEP has enjoyed the cooperation of the USEPA in addressing the issues of concern posed by this Site, and looks forward to ultimately resolving them through this Record of Decision Amendment. If you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Mark Hyland or members of his staff.

Sincerely,



David Lennett  
Director, Bureau of Remediation and Waste Management

cc: Martha G. Kirkpatrick, Commissioner – MEDEP  
Mark Hyland, Director – Division of Remediation  
Denise Messier, Supervisor – Superfund and Federal Facilities Unit

**F. O'CONNOR SUPERFUND SITE**

**OPERABLE UNIT 2**

**September 2002 ROD AMENDMENT**

**APPENDIX D - REFERENCES CITED**

US Environmental Protection Agency, "Record of Decision Summary O'Connor Company Superfund Site", September 27, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Consent Decree, United States of America, Plaintiff v. Central Maine Power, Defendant", September 3, 1991

\_\_\_\_\_, "Explanation of Significant Differences for the F. O'Connor Company Superfund Site", July 11, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Remedial Design/Remedial Action Revised Statement of Work, O'Connor Company Superfund Site, Augusta, Maine", October 1994 (SOW is appendix A to CD)

\_\_\_\_\_, "Invocation of Contingency Remedy for the F. O'Connor Company Superfund Site", October 10, 1995.

Woodard & Curran, Inc., "Management of Migration Comprehensive Evaluation, O'Connor Superfund Site", August 1997

\_\_\_\_\_, "Final Source Control Remedial Action Report" September 1, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Oil Study in the Upland Marsh Area at the CMP O'Connor Site in Augusta, Maine, Woodard & Curran, January 1999

\_\_\_\_\_, "1999 Riggs Brook Sediment and Biota Monitoring Report, O'Connor Company Superfund Site", February 2000

\_\_\_\_\_, "2000 Riggs Brook Sediment and Biota Monitoring Report, O'Connor Company Superfund Site", July, 2001

\_\_\_\_\_, "Management of Migration Sampling and Analysis Quarterly Report, O'Connor Company Superfund Site", October 26, 2001

\_\_\_\_\_, "2001 Riggs Brook Sediment and Biota Monitoring Report, O'Connor Company Superfund Site", December 13, 2001

\_\_\_\_\_, "Technical Impracticability Evaluation for OU-2 Management of Migration, O'Connor Company Superfund Site", June 7, 2002