



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

NOTE

TO: Regional Administrators, Deputy Regional Administrators, Superfund Policy Managers, Community Involvement Coordinators, and Press Officers

FROM: Marianne Horinko, Assistant Administrator, OSWER

RE: Superfund at Work, Communication Package

DATE: October 10, 2002

The attached information package is designed to highlight the tremendous work being done at Superfund sites across the country. Working together with States, Tribes, communities, local governments, and many other stakeholders, Superfund has produced impressive results.

Talking points, questions and answers, and site-specific information are included in this package. Additionally, the Headquarters' Superfund website was updated to provide case studies about the program. These one to two page stories provide a more "human interest" look into the Superfund program and are part of OSWER's commitment to providing a broader understanding of the Agency's waste programs. If you have any questions or need additional assistance, please feel free to contact any of the people listed below. Thank you for your dedication and hard work on the Superfund program.

Marjorie Buckholtz, Director, OSWER Innovation, Partnerships and Communications Office,
202-566-0205.

Marsha Minter, Associate Director, OSWER Innovation, Partnerships and Communications
Office, 202-566-0215

Suzanne Wells, Center Director, OERR Community Involvement and Outreach Center,
703-603-8863

Jennifer Browne, Program Analyst, OERR Community Involvement and Outreach Center,
703-603-8922.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Superfund Communication Strategy October 10, 2002

Purpose: The Superfund Communication Strategy highlights the work Superfund is doing to clean up sites.

Strategy: This strategy is designed to promote outreach to citizens who live near Superfund sites across the country. Highlighting Superfund accomplishments and community presence via local and regional media is the primary approach for this effort. Nationally, EPA Senior Managers will be prepared to answer questions regarding end of year numbers and various reports coming out in September.

Timing: See below

Messages (Fiscal Year 2002 data as of October 10, 2002):

! Superfund was hard at work in FY 2002 cleaning up toxic waste sites, and compelling responsible parties to clean up their sites.

Sites with imminent threats to human health are being addressed.

! 724 construction projects are underway at 455 NPL sites across the country. In Fiscal Year 2002, EPA obligated \$308 million to fund long-term remedial action work, 40% more than the \$220 million originally budgeted at the beginning of the fiscal year. Among those sites identified by the July Inspector General's report, only seven sites did not receive funding to begin new cleanup construction.

Through EPA's removal program, 420 responses to imminent threats to human health or the environment have been taken. In Fiscal Year 2002, EPA spent approximately \$155 million to conduct emergency and non-time critical removal response actions, excluding the anthrax decontamination work.

This year's unique challenges in the removal program included responding to the September 11 New York City, Pentagon, and Pennsylvania attacks, and the anthrax attack. In Fiscal Year 2002, EPA spent more than \$25 million to respond to the anthrax attacks.

EPA is committed to the "polluter pays principle." Over 70% of the construction in the program was paid for by Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) or those private parties responsible for the contamination. Last year alone, EPA secured a near record \$1.7 billion from PRPs.

! Regardless of whether new taxes are ever imposed to finance Superfund, the Administration will continue to take enforcement action against polluters to require them to clean up sites they caused and will continue to request funds through the appropriations process for clean up of orphan sites.

EPA is committed to setting Superfund on a sustainable course for its third decade and has asked the National Advisory Council on Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) Superfund Subcommittee to help chart a future path for the Superfund program.

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>
Sept. 23	Distribute press kit with Q and As, talking points, background information, factsheets, desk statement, etc. for Senior Management and HQ and Regional press offices. <u>Regional Plans</u> - Regions continue to publicize release of cleanup dollars, construction completions, and start of cleanup work.
Sept 24	<u>SF Communications</u> Network conference call
Sept. 26	Reg.3 (RA) Construction Completion event at Dupont (Newport Landfill site), DE
Sept. TBD	Reg. 1 (RA/AA) New Funding event at New Bedford Harbor site, MA
Sept. 30	Web update: Enforcement Success Stories (PRP lead)
Oct.5	End of Year Construction/Completion #s final list IG Background Materials (Qs & As, TPs, Fact sheets) to Regions
Oct. 15	Remedial Actions funded (ongoing/new starts) final list IG Report Released (33 sites)
Oct. 30	Phase II Funding– Summary of additional funding decisions Note to Correspondents or Press Advisory-optional

Contact: Marjorie Buckholtz, 566-0205
or Marsha Minter, 566-0215



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Background Information **Superfund End of FY 2002 Update** **October 10, 2002**

Main Messages - The State of Superfund

- Superfund was hard at work in FY2002 cleaning up toxic waste sites, and compelling responsible parties to clean up their sites.
- Sites with imminent threats to human health are being addressed.
- 724 construction projects are underway at 455 NPL sites across the country. In Fiscal Year 2002, EPA obligated \$308 million to fund long-term remedial action work, 40% more than originally budgeted at the beginning of the fiscal year \$220 million. Among those sites identified by the July Inspector General's report, only seven sites did not receive funding to begin new cleanup construction.
- Through EPA's removal program, 420 responses to imminent threats to human health or the environment were taken. In Fiscal Year 2002, EPA spent approximately \$155 million to conduct emergency and non-time critical removal response actions, excluding the anthrax decontamination work.
- This year's unique challenges in the removal program included responding to the September 11 New York City, Pentagon, and Pennsylvania attacks, and the anthrax attack. In Fiscal Year 2002, EPA spent more than \$25 million to respond to the anthrax attacks.
- EPA is committed to the "polluter pays principle." Approximately 70% of the construction in the program was paid for by Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) or those private parties responsible for the contamination. Last year alone, EPA secured a near record \$1.7 billion from PRPs.
- Regardless of whether new taxes are ever imposed to finance Superfund, the Administration will continue to take enforcement action against polluters to require them to clean up sites they caused and will continue to request funds through the appropriations process for clean up of orphan sites.
- EPA is committed to setting Superfund on a sustainable course for its third decade and has asked the National Advisory Council on Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) Superfund Subcommittee to help chart a future path for the Superfund program.

The 2002 Situation

- In FY 2002, EPA provided approximately \$735 million to conduct site response work and support state and tribal programs, including:
 - \$155 million for removal actions;
 - \$272 million for assessments, investigations, remedy selection and design, and State, tribal, and community involvement; and
 - \$308 million for long term cleanup work (remedial actions and long-term response actions).
- EPA works hard to ensure that all unused resources from prior year appropriations are recouped and put back to work. By scouring old and expired contracts, EPA was able to harness an additional \$200 million to support cleanup work in FY 2002 (included in the \$735 million above).
- EPA augmented its FY 2002 cleanup efforts by using approximately \$55 million contributed by States (remedial action cost share) and private parties (settlements).
- Although EPA finances a significant amount of construction activity, the bulk of Superfund construction work is conducted by PRPs through settlements, for removal, remedial investigations and design, and construction activities. Generally, PRPs conduct (or finance) approximately 70% of the remedial construction activity undertaken at non-federal facility Superfund sites. The cumulative value, since the inception of the program, of PRP commitments for response and cost recovery settlements is more than \$20 billion.

Superfund at Work: Funding and IG Report

- Superfund funding has remained steady. In Fiscal Year 2002, Superfund was funded at \$1.3 billion. This is consistent with the level of funding received in FY2000 and FY2001.
- A July, 2002, EPA Inspector General report listed 33 sites in 18 states that had not yet received funding for cleanup work in FY 2002. This report led some to believe that cleanup work is stopping at sites across the country. In fact, the program continues to clean up listed sites and add new sites that will be cleaned up in the future.
- The IG report did not reflect the Superfund program funding decisions made after May. Of the 33 sites the IG identified as having not received funding:
 - 21 sites received funding for on-going cleanup work or funding to begin construction on a new phase of cleanup in FY2002;
 - 5 sites did not need funding in FY2002 because construction was not ready to begin; and
 - 7 sites were not funded in FY2002, and will be reconsidered for funding in FY03.

Cleanup Progress

- 846 sites or 56% of the sites on the NPL are now construction complete.
- 42 sites were construction complete in FY2002.
 - Construction completions declined to 47 in FY2001 and 42 in FY2002 because the sites remaining to be completed are extremely complex.
 - The remaining universe of sites include a larger percentage of federal facility and mega sites. Mega sites are NPL sites with actual or expected total removal and remedial action costs of \$50 million or more. Federal facilities and mega sites account for 8.5% of the construction completion sites, and 34.3% of the sites not construction complete. The remaining universe of sites includes:
 - Over 120 mega sites, and
 - 171 final NPL federal facility sites; 6 proposed NPL federal facility sites.
 - The remaining universe of sites has twice the number of operable units as past construction completion sites. An operable unit is a discrete portion of the site that is being cleaned up, e.g., a site may be broken up into an operable unit addressing contaminated ground water, and an operable unit addressing contaminated soils on a site. Construction completion sites average 1.6 operable units, and sites not construction complete average 3.8 operable units.
 - The higher number of operable units needing to be addressed is leading to increased costs.
- In FY2002, the Department of Defense provided EPA with \$8.6 million for our support in cleaning up contaminated Base Realignment and Closure properties, supporting EPA's oversight, technical assistance and property transfer responsibilities.

Superfund Continues to List New Sites

- On February 26, 2002, EPA proposed two new sites to the NPL. In addition, on September 5, 2002, the Agency proposed seven new sites to the NPL, and placed 19 sites on the final NPL. A total of nine sites were proposed to the NPL in FY2002.
- With the 19 new sites added to the NPL on September 5, 2002, the NPL (as of September 6, 2002) contains 1,238 final sites – 1,079 in the general section and 159 Federal facilities section. A total of 62 sites are now proposed to the NPL, and awaiting final Agency action – 56 general sites and 6 Federal facility sites.
- For the newly listed sites without viable, responsible parties, EPA does not expect to need significant construction funds for several years, since investigations to determine the full extent of the contamination must first be conducted.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Background Information **FREQUENTLY ASKED SUPERFUND QUESTIONS** **October 10, 2002**

FUNDING REMEDIAL ACTIONS

1) QUESTION - How much money did the Agency spend on Superfund-financed remedial action projects (long-term cleanup construction work) in Fiscal Year 2002?

ANSWER - In FY 2002, EPA obligated \$308 million (including \$13 million spent on three removals at National Priorities List (NPL) sites) to fund long-term remedial action work. This is 40% more than the \$220 million originally budgeted at the beginning of the fiscal year. In addition, EPA further augmented its remedial construction cleanup efforts in FY 2002 by using approximately \$40 million dollars contributed by States for cost share of remedial action, and by potentially responsible parties (PRPs) through settlements.

2) QUESTION - Did EPA have sufficient resources to continue **ongoing cleanup actions at all NPL sites in fiscal year 2002?**

ANSWER - Yes. In Fiscal Year 2002, all sites with ongoing remedial action needs received funding.

3) QUESTION - Did Superfund fund all sites that had **new long-term cleanup (remedial action) starts** planned in fiscal year 2002?

ANSWER - No. EPA spent \$77 million to begin work at 19 new long-term cleanup projects in Fiscal Year 2002.

- Funding allocation is a dynamic and variable process. Decisions are made based on removing risk, progress as sites move through the pipeline, and the amount of funding secured from private parties through aggressive enforcement actions.
- The Superfund program identifies immediate threats to people living near a site. If there are immediate threats, an emergency response or removal action either has or will be taken. These actions may include removing soil or containers of hazardous wastes, draining waste ponds, providing a safe supply of drinking water, and securing the site to prevent direct contact with hazardous substances; and

- Early stages of cleanup may already be completed at sites where new remedial action starts were planned in fiscal year 2002, and this previous work has addressed threats posed by the site.

Among those 33 sites identified by the July, 2002 Inspector General's report, only seven sites did not receive funding to begin new cleanup construction.

4) QUESTION - Did EPA stop any ongoing projects at NPL sites where cleanup activities had already begun?

ANSWER - No. To date we do not anticipate the need to stop work on projects already underway.

5) QUESTION - Why does EPA make funding decisions for remedial actions so late during the fiscal year?

ANSWER - Congress requires EPA to withhold releasing the last \$100 million of its annual budget until September 1 of each year. Additionally, changing site conditions, and technical, logistical, enforcement, and community issues, can affect a specific project's need for remedial action resources. Therefore, Regional plans to spend money at certain sites change over the course of the year, and money that had previously been allocated to one site may become available for use at another site. To account for these uncertainties, EPA allocates resources for remedial action throughout the year. As a result of all of these circumstances, final funding plans for remedial action are not known until the end of the fiscal year.

In addition, EPA regularly reviews its accounts to determine whether unspent resources from previous appropriations are available for use in the current year. EPA Regions and Headquarters develop annual plans for the distribution of these resources. EPA's success in identifying and releasing these resources contributes to the funds available for remedial action, but the total amount that is actually available for such use is not known until the end of the fiscal year.

6) QUESTION - What Superfund activities are funded from the remedial action budget?

ANSWER - The remedial action budget is used for the following Superfund construction and post construction activities.

Remedial Actions - long-term cleanups at NPL sites

Removal actions - initial response actions at NPL sites to address a specific problem or risk while studies for a long-term cleanup are underway (examples during Fiscal Year 2002 include Libby, Montana and Eastland Woolen Mills)

Long-term Response Actions - operation of fund-financed ground water restoration systems for up to 10 years following completion of construction; States assume responsibility for system operations after 10 year period

Five-Year Reviews - reviews done every five years to ensure remedies remain protective.

HOW ARE SITES PRIORITIZED FOR REMEDIAL ACTION FUNDING?

7) QUESTION - How does EPA decide which sites get remedial action cleanup funding and which don't?

ANSWER - Priorities for funding Superfund construction projects are established as follows:

The highest priority is given to funding emergencies which pose imminent endangerment to human health and the environment, for example, Libby, MT.

Ongoing construction actions which have already begun (including long-term remedial actions and 5-year reviews), and which require additional resources are funded next. Ongoing actions receive a high priority for funding for several reasons. First, once an action is started, the best management practice is to complete it so contamination is not left exposed or allowed to recontaminate an area. In addition, significant additional costs could be incurred if these projects were to be shut down in the middle of cleanup construction, and restarted at a later date.

After emergencies and ongoing construction actions are funded, EPA funds new construction actions. New construction actions are ranked according to the risk posed by the site. This is done through EPA's National Risk-Based Priority Panel evaluation process. The results of Panel's evaluation are taken into consideration along with the status of overall site progress in determining the funding priority of new construction actions.

8) QUESTION - What is the process for evaluating projects through the National Risk-Based Priority Panel?

ANSWER - The Panel is comprised of national program experts from each EPA Regional office and Headquarters. They evaluate each new project with respect to weighted criteria reflecting the relative risk associated with the site conditions. In evaluating sites, the panel considers information such as:

- The contaminants at the site, and the likelihood that the contamination could impact on- and off-site areas;
- The potential for human exposure (both current and future); and
- The potential for ecological impacts (both current and future).

The Regional representatives do not score the projects from their respective Region. The results of the Panel's evaluation are taken into consideration along with the status of overall site progress in determining the funding priority of new construction projects.

CONSTRUCTION COMPLETIONS

9) QUESTION - What is a construction completion site?

ANSWER - At sites where construction is completed, there is no longer a threat to the health and well-being of the surrounding community. EPA has designed and built a cleanup remedy which prevents contaminants from spreading through the soil, surface water or ground water. A construction completion occurs when three conditions are met:

- No further on-site construction is necessary;
- All immediate threats have been eliminated; and
- All long-term threats are under control.

A site may reach construction completion without all cleanup work being finished. There still may be an ongoing operation, such as pumping and treating ground water. However, EPA will not count a site as a construction completion if there is still a risk posed to public health or the environment.

10) QUESTION - Why has there been a drop in the number of construction completions done by Superfund?

ANSWER - The Superfund program's key measure of accomplishment has been construction completions, and EPA remains committed to completing cleanups at Superfund sites. As of October 1, 2002, EPA has achieved construction completion at 846 of 1498 NPL sites (56%). By fiscal year 2001, the Superfund program determined that there were not enough site candidates to sustain the previous pace of construction completion. EPA achieved 47 construction completions in 2001 and surpassed its Fiscal Year 2002 target with a total of 42 construction completes. There are several reasons for the decline in the construction completions:

The surge in construction completions in the mid to late 1990s followed a surge in remedial action start activity during the early to mid 1990s. A decline in remedial action start activity during the late 1990s, followed a pattern of fewer annual NPL site additions since the early 1990s (80 % of the sites on the NPL were added in the first 8 years of the program). This decline in Superfund site listings is affecting the number of construction completions EPA will be able to achieve during the early 2000s.

In previous years, EPA placed a priority on sites that were further along in the cleanup process, creating a backlog of sites with significant years of work remaining. The remaining universe of NPL sites that are not construction complete are more complex than sites that have already achieved construction completion, thus affecting construction completions. Many factors are included in complexity, which affects the duration and cost of cleanups. Examples of some such factors include: contaminant characteristics, presence of multiple contaminants, area and volume of contamination, ecological issues, ground water issues, site location and proximity to populations, financial resources of responsible parties, and stakeholder interests (States, Tribes, communities, natural resource trustees).

11) QUESTION - What is EPA doing to improve program performance?

ANSWER - Superfund has begun a Pipeline Management Review of Superfund sites to better determine future budget needs, and make sure that Agency resources are properly focused to achieve maximum results. This review will:

- Allocate resources for new and existing construction projects based on a multi-year strategy (fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004) to manage toward creating an optimal balance between achievement of risk reduction and construction progress;
- Revise the NPL listing policy to ensure we list only the highest priority sites that cannot be cleaned up by other means; and
- Evaluate program policy impacts on cleanup costs (e.g., ground water restoration).

PLACING SITES ON THE NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST (NPL)

12) QUESTION - Has Superfund stopped listing sites on the NPL?

ANSWER - No. EPA published a new listing on September 5 in the Federal Register. This new listing brings the Fiscal Year 2002 total listings to 19 final sites and 7 proposed sites.

13) QUESTION - When will EPA be able to start remedial investigations at sites proposed to the NPL?

ANSWER - Once a site is proposed to the NPL, several things happen. First, Superfund studies the site to see if there are any immediate threats to people living near the site. If there are, an emergency response or removal action may already have been or will be taken. These actions may include removing soil or containers of hazardous wastes, draining waste ponds, providing a safe supply of drinking water, or installing fences to prevent direct contact with hazardous substances.

Second, a search for the parties responsible for the contamination at the site begins (often this search begins prior to the proposal of sites to the NPL). Historically, responsible parties have performed work at approximately 70 percent of the sites on the NPL.

At the beginning of fiscal year 2002, Superfund planned to start approximately 30 Federal fund-lead remedial investigation starts. The costs associated with remedial investigations are relatively small when compared to remedial action costs. The funding needed to investigate these sites will not take funding away from sites that are awaiting remedial action funding. Placing sites on the NPL is an important step in addressing the nation's most seriously contaminated sites.

SUPERFUND TAX AND BUDGET

14) QUESTION - What affect has the expiration of the Superfund tax had on the level of funding for the Superfund program?

ANSWER - The expiration of the tax has not affected the appropriated funding for the Superfund program. Although the Superfund tax expired in 1995, the annual appropriations for the program have remained relatively steady. In addition, since fiscal year 1987, Congress has supplemented the Superfund appropriation by appropriating funding from general revenues. EPA is confident that Congress and the Administration will continue to work together to provide adequate funding for the Superfund program.

15) QUESTION - Why didn't EPA's budget request to Congress reflect all of the money needed to do projected Superfund work?

ANSWER - The President's budget request for Superfund balances Superfund needs with other Administration priorities, including homeland security. In Fiscal Year 2003, the President's budget request maintains steady funding for Superfund at \$1.3 billion. EPA will continue to prioritize projects based on their relative risk to human health and the environment to ensure that available funds are directed to the highest priority sites and projects.

Funding needs for the program will be closely examined in the fiscal year 2004 budget cycle. There is a better understanding now of the remedial action needs than existed when the fiscal year 2002 budget was developed, and this will help the Superfund program develop its fiscal year 2004 budget request.

16) QUESTION - How was the nearly \$1.3 billion appropriated for the Superfund program spent in Fiscal Year 2002?

ANSWER - EPA allocated nearly \$920 million (70% of the \$1.3 billion) in fiscal year 2002 to support the Superfund Response program, which includes site investigation, listing, and cleanup activity, oversight of responsible party and federal facility cleanups, and state, tribal, and local involvement in the Superfund process. Additionally, EPA used nearly \$170 million (13%) for enforcement. EPA also allocated \$135 million (10%) to maintain the infrastructure (rent, utilities, security, financial data systems) necessary to implement the program, and more than \$45 million (4%) to support science and technology efforts to ensure that cleanups are based on the best available science, and to support the evaluation and audit functions of the Office of the Inspector General.

17) QUESTION - How are the Superfund Response program's resources used if the Agency is only spending \$220 million from the response budget for remedial construction?

ANSWER - Of the \$1.3 billion FY 2002 Superfund appropriation, EPA allocated \$920 million for the Superfund response program. The response program funds numerous types of site-specific cleanup actions as well as supporting functions. Remedial construction is a key component of the Superfund program, but numerous other actions must be taken to support overall site cleanup and fulfill EPA's congressional mandate. The table below describes EPA's beginning of year budget for various functions. This budget is based on the FY 2002 appropriation. EPA also works hard to ensure that all unused resources from prior year appropriations are recouped and put back to work. By scouring old and expired contracts, EPA was able to harness an additional \$200 million to support cleanup work in FY 2002 (not included

in the chart).

Function	Beginning of Year FY 2002 Response Program Budget (\$ millions, rounded to multiples of 5)
Removal (including Environmental Response Team)	\$130
Site Assessment	\$35
Investigations, Design, Oversight, Laboratory and Technical Support	\$155
Remedial Action	\$220
State, Tribal, and Community Involvement	\$25
Response Program Support (policy development and implementation, analysis, information management)	\$75
Federal Facility Program Implementation	\$15
Chemical and Emergency Preparedness	\$5
Technology Innovation	\$5
Other Federal Agency Participation	\$10
Salaries and Expenses (excluding Brownfields)	\$150
Brownfields Program (including payroll)	\$95
Total	\$920

THE FUTURE OF SUPERFUND

18) QUESTION: Why was the National Advisory Committee on Environmental Policy and Technology Superfund Subcommittee formed, and how were NACEPT members selected to be on the Superfund Subcommittee?

ANSWER: EPA formed the NACEPT Superfund Subcommittee to assist EPA in identifying the future direction of the Superfund program in the context of other Federal and State waste and site cleanup programs. Specifically, the Subcommittee will seek to provide answers to questions that relate to: a) the role of the NPL; b) the cleanup of very large, expensive sites, and c) measuring program performance.

The Superfund Subcommittee was formed under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), the law which provides the legal framework under which the Federal government creates advisory committees. FACA requires that committees be balanced in terms of the points of view represented and the expertise required relative to a panel's charge. In addition, NACEPT has criteria for its membership which includes:

Occupy a senior position within their organization.
Broad experience outside of their current position.
Experience in public policy issues.
Membership in broad-based networks.
Extensive experience in the environmental field.
Recognized expert in the subject matter to be addressed by NACEPT.

Individuals from across the spectrum of Superfund stakeholder organizations make up the Subcommittee-- from EJ to industry. In all, 31 non-Federal members serve on the Subcommittee. Dr. Ray Loehr, from the University of Texas at Austin, is the chairman. Three members from EPA's senior management team serve as Agency representatives to the panel.

21) QUESTION: How will EPA incorporate NACEPT's recommendation in its overall program agenda?

ANSWER - NACEPT is an advisory committee's whose recommendations are considered in the totality of EPA's mandate: protection of human health and the environment. EPA has asked NACEPT to conduct a public dialogue on several key issues such as 1) the role of the National Priorities List, 2) the role of Superfund at very large, expensive sites, and 3) mechanisms to measure performance. While the Agency is not bound by the advice offered by the Subcommittee, EPA will place great importance on the panel's deliberations.

22) QUESTION – What is the timeframe for the Subcommittee's deliberations?

ANSWER - The Subcommittee will deliberate for an 18-month period which began in June 2002. During that period, the Agency expects the Subcommittee to meet approximately six times.

23) QUESTION – How will the Subcommittee accomplish its work and what kind of a work product are they going to fashion?

ANSWER - The Subcommittee has organized itself into three working groups focused on performance measures, site types and other cleanup programs. These groups will develop policy options to present for the full Subcommittee's consideration. The Agency has asked the panel to render consensus-based recommendations.

Background Information
Superfund at Work
National Summary for FY2002
October 10, 2002

Superfund was hard at work in FY2002 cleaning up toxic waste sites, and compelling responsible parties to clean up their sites

Superfund spent millions of dollars to cleanup sites

\$308 million was spent on Superfund-financed remedial action projects (including \$13 million spent on three removals at National Priorities List (NPL) sites)

\$191 million was spent at 62 on-going projects

\$77 million was spent at 19 new-start projects

\$27 million was spent at 45 long-term remedial action projects

Superfund cleaned up sites across the country

420 removals were started

724 construction projects were ongoing at 455 sites

71% of the cleanups at Superfund sites were performed by responsible parties

42 sites were construction complete (846 sites or 56% of the sites on the National Priorities List (NPL) are now construction complete)

Superfund continued to identify new hazardous waste sites

7 sites were proposed to the NPL, and 19 sites were placed on the final NPL

Superfund helped communities reuse sites

\$1.2 million was awarded to communities for redevelopment grants

Superfund responded with its federal partners to assist in the terrorism responses

Provided substantial environmental sampling analysis at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and the Pennsylvania plane crash site, planned and implemented the cleanup of the anthrax contamination on Capitol Hill, and assisted with anthrax cleanups across the country



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Do not Distribute

Current Status of 33 Sites Mentioned in NY Times Article on 7/23/02
September 18, 2002

Notes:

Underlined sites are Prioritization Panel ranked sites that did not receive funding in FY01.

Italicized sites are Prioritization Panel ranked sites that did not receive funding in FY00 or FY01.

All sites are funded by EPA Headquarters unless otherwise noted.

Sites Receiving Funding (21 sites)

RG	ST	City/County	Site Name	Funding	Status
4	FL	Clermont	Tower Chemical Company	Funded – \$100,000 (Regional deobs)	new start
4	FL	Lake Park	Trans Circuits, Inc.	Funded – \$500,000 (Regional deobs)	new start
4	<i>FL</i>	<i>Pensacola</i>	<i>American Creosote Works, Inc. (Pensacola Plant)</i>	<i>Funded - \$2.7 M</i>	<i>new start</i>
4	FL	Port Salerno	Solitron Microwave	Funded by Florida at \$268,000	new start
4	FL	Tampa	Southern Solvents, Inc.	Funded – \$532,000	new start
6	<u>LA</u>	<u>Ponchatoula, Tangipahoa Parish</u>	<u>Delatte Metals</u>	<u>Funded – \$14.0 M</u>	<u>new start</u>
5	MI	Benton Harbor	Aircraft Components (D & L Sales)	Funded - \$1.5 M	new start
8	<u>MT</u>	<u>Jefferson County</u>	<u>Basin Mining Area</u>	<u>Funded - \$1.3 M</u>	<u>new start</u>

8	MT	Lewis & Clark County	Upper Tenmile Creek Mining Area	Funded - \$1.0 M	new start
7	NE	Columbus	10 th Street Site	Funded - \$1.7 M	new start
2	NJ	Between Chester & Washington Townships	Combe Fill South Landfill	Funded - \$1.15 M	on-going
2	NY	Delaware County	GCL Tie & Treating Inc	Funded - \$2.5 M	on-going
2	NJ	Edison Township	Chemical Insecticide Corp.	Funded - \$7.5 M	new start
<u>2</u>	<u>NJ</u>	<u>Marlboro Township</u>	<u>Burnt Fly Bog</u>	<u>Funded - \$20.1 M</u>	<u>new start</u>
2	NJ	Somerset County	Montgomery Township Housing Development	Funded – \$2.0 M	new start
2	NJ	Somerset County	Rocky Hill Municipal Well	Funded – \$2.0 M	new start
6	<u>OK</u>	<u>Cushing</u>	<u>Hudson Refinery</u>	<u>Funded - \$3.0 M</u>	<u>new start</u>
6	OK	Picher, Cardin, Quapaw, Commerce, & North Miami	Tar Creek (Ottawa County)	Funded - \$5.0 M (Regional deobs)	on-going
4	TN	Fayetteville	Ross Metals, Inc	Funded - \$3.0 M	on-going
<u>6</u>	<u>TX</u>	<u>Ector County</u>	<u>Sprague Road Ground Water Plume</u>	<u>Funded - \$4.0 M</u>	<u>new start</u>
2	VI	St. Thomas	Tutu Wellfield	Funded - \$5.6 M	new start

Sites Not Needing Funding (5 sites)

RG	ST	City/County	Site Name	Funding	Status
8	CO	Denver	Vasquez Boulevard and I-70	Funding is not needed because construction is not yet ready to begin. (The Record of Decision (ROD) is not complete.).	new start
7	NE	Hastings	Hastings Groundwater Contamination	Funding is not needed because construction is not yet ready to begin. (The design has not been completed).	new start
1	NH	Merrimack	New Hampshire Plating Co.	Funding is not needed because construction is not yet ready to begin. (The design has not been completed).	new start
3	PA	Portions of Borough of Lansdale, Hatfield, Towamencin & Upper Gwynned Townships	North Penn Area 6	This site did not need funding in FY2002.	on-going
3	VA	Frederick County	Rhinehart Tire Fire Dump	This site did not need funding in FY2002.	on-going

Sites Not Receiving Funding (7 sites)

RG	ST	City/County	Site Name	Funding	Status
5	IL	Granite City	Jennison-Wright Corporation	<i>Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to either human health or the environment. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.</i>	<i>new start</i>
5	IN	Kokomo	Continental Steel Corp.	See above.	new start
6	LA	East Feliciana Parish	Central Wood Preserving Co.	See above.	new start
1	MA	Fairhaven	Atlas Tack Corp.	See above.	new start
<u>6</u>	<u>TX</u>	<u>Jasper</u>	<u>Hart Creosoting Co.</u>	<u>See above.</u>	<u>new start</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>TX</u>	<u>Jasper</u>	<u>Jasper Creosoting, Inc.</u>	<u>See above.</u>	<u>new start</u>
1	VT	Strafford and Thetford	Elizabeth Mine	See above.	new start



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Do not Distribute

ATLAS TACK CORPORATION

Fairhaven, Massachusetts

Site Description: The Atlas Tack facility, a 24-acre site located in Fairhaven, MA, was built in 1901 and manufactured tacks, steel nails, rivets, and bolts until 1985. From the early 1940s until the 1970s, wastewater containing cyanide and heavy metals was discharged into an onsite lagoon, eventually contaminating the soil and groundwater. Three separate areas of the site are contaminated with volatile organic compounds (VOCs), heavy metals, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Approximately 7,200 people live within a one-mile radius of the site, which is located in a mixed residential and commercial area.

Current Site Status: EPA continues to monitor the site to ensure there is no immediate threat to human health or the environment pending the start of long-term cleanup work.

Current Funding Status: Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to either human health or the environment. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.

Overall Environmental Progress and EPA Actions: EPA has spent more than \$2.8 million to limit human exposure to contaminated soils and sludge. In 1998, EPA completed investigations into the nature and extent of site contamination. In 1999, EPA limited access to the site by requiring the potentially responsible party to install a fence around the site. In 1999, EPA's emergency response and removal program removed asbestos from three dilapidated buildings on the site, preventing the possibility of local community residents inhaling asbestos fibers. Additionally, the Town of Fairhaven has banned shellfishing on or near the site to prohibit the possible ingestion of contaminated fish.

A three phased cleanup plan for the Atlas Tack site was approved on March 10, 2000. In phase one, EPA will demolish two of the three remaining buildings. In the second phase, EPA will remove 54,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil, debris and sediments, for disposal at a licensed, offsite facility. Once this is completed, EPA will use a method called phytoremediation <http://www.epa.gov/tio/download/citizens/citphyto.pdf>, to prevent any contaminated groundwater from leaving the site. Finally, EPA will restore the marsh and continue to monitor the systems that were installed to clean the groundwater.

EPA Funding Process: EPA funds cleanup work at sites that fall into three categories: sites that pose immediate danger to human health or the environment, sites where specific cleanup projects

have already begun, and sites where new cleanup projects could be started. Sites that fall into the first two categories are the highest priority to receive funding. Sites in the third category receive funding based on the availability of funds, the relative risk to human health and the environment as determined in part by the National Risk-Based Priority Panel, and other programmatic factors including the potential availability of responsible parties to conduct the work.

For more information on this site, please read the Atlas Tack Corporation Fact Sheet on the Region 1 Superfund Web site. <http://www.epa.gov/ne/superfund/sites/atlas>



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Do not Distribute

CENTRAL WOOD PRESERVING

East Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Site Description: Central Wood Preserving, a 17 acre site located in an unincorporated area of East Feliciana Parish near the town of Slaughter (population 827), operated as a wood preserving facility from the 1950s until 1991. The company used creosote, copper oxide, chromic acid, and arsenic acid (copper chromium arsenate) in its operations. Now abandoned and inactive, the soil at the site is contaminated with arsenic, benzo-a-pyrene (BAP), and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and the sediment is contaminated with arsenic. Nine residences border the northwest portion of the site.

Current Site Status: EPA continues to monitor the site to ensure there is no immediate threat to human health or the environment pending the start of long-term cleanup work.

Current Funding Status: Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to either human health or the environment. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.

Overall Environmental Progress and EPA Actions: Since 1995, EPA has spent more than \$2 million to limit human exposure to the contaminated soil and sediments. After determining the extent of contamination at the site, EPA's emergency response and removal program demolished 4 buildings and 10 above ground storage tanks. Additionally, EPA disposed of the tanks' contents and removed 1,520 cubic yards of contaminated soil and sediment from the site. These actions addressed all of the immediate human health and environmental risks at the site.

In April 2001, EPA selected a plan for the long-term cleanup of the site. Using a process called thermal desorption, <http://www.epa.gov/tio/download/citizens/citthermal.pdf> EPA will clean 9,200 cubic yards of contaminated soil and sediment. EPA will also take and then 19,060 cubic yards of arsenic contaminated soil and sediment for disposal offsite. This cleanup will reduce the long-term health and environmental risks associated with the contaminated soil and sediments, and allow the site to be reused for residential and other purposes.

In June 2000, EPA awarded the East Feliciana Parish a \$100,000 Superfund Redevelopment Initiative Grant to help the local residents redevelop the property into picnic areas, trails, and baseball fields.

EPA Funding Process: EPA funds cleanup work at sites that fall into three categories: sites that pose immediate danger to human health or the environment, sites where specific cleanup projects

have already begun, and sites where new cleanup projects could be started. Sites that fall into the first two categories are the highest priority to receive funding. Sites in the third category receive funding based on the availability of funds, the relative risk to human health and the environment as determined in part by the National Risk-Based Priority Panel, and other programmatic factors including the potential availability of responsible parties to conduct the work.

For more information on this site, please read the Central Wood Preserving Fact Sheet (PDF format, 5 pages) on the Region 6 Superfund Web site.

<http://www.epa.gov/earth1r6/6sf/pdffiles/central.pdf>.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Do not Distribute
CONTINENTAL STEEL CORPORATION
Kokomo, Indiana

Site Description: Continental Steel Corporation produced nails, wire, and wire fence from scrap steel from 1914 through 1986. Located in Kokomo, IN, (population 46,000), the 183-acre site is in a mixed residential, commercial, and industrial area. After the company filed for bankruptcy in 1986, U.S. EPA and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) found soil, sediments, surface water and groundwater contaminated with volatile organic compounds (VOCs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and several metals, including lead, on and near the site. The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study conducted between 1993 and 1998 determined that there were unacceptable risks at the site.

Current Site Status: EPA continues to monitor the site to ensure there is no immediate threat to human health or the environment pending the start of long-term cleanup work.

Current Funding Status: Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to either human health or the environment. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.

Overall Environmental Progress and EPA Actions: To date EPA and IDEM have spent more than \$35 million to limit human and environmental exposure at the site. From 1990 through 1994, the U.S. EPA's Emergency Response and Removal Program removed 2,450 buried drums, 1,250 cubic yards of contaminated soil, 90 cubic yards of lead dust, 121 cubic yards of PCBs, 2,284 tons of solidified oil, over 200 chemicals from a metallurgical laboratory and recycled 65,647 gallons of No. 6 bunker oil. In June 1997, IDEM and U.S. EPA's Emergency Response and Removal Program returned to the site to remove and dispose of lead-contaminated soil found in a residential area adjacent to the site. IDEM also conducted an interim remedial action that decontaminated and demolished the remaining buildings in the Main Plant Area. In September 1998, IDEM and the U.S. EPA announced the long-term cleanup plan for the site. The plan includes remedies for contaminated soils, sediments, and groundwater that address the unacceptable risks remaining at the site. Overall cost of the remaining clean-up could be as high as \$85 - 90 million.

EPA Funding Process: EPA funds cleanup work at sites that fall into three categories: sites that pose immediate danger to human health or the environment, sites where specific cleanup projects have already begun, and sites where new cleanup projects could be started. Sites that fall into the first two categories are the highest priority to receive funding. Sites in the third category receive funding based on the availability of funds, the relative risk to human health and the environment as determined in part by the National Risk-Based Priority Panel, and other programmatic factors including the potential availability of responsible parties to conduct the work.

For more information on this site, please read the Continental Steel Corporation Fact Sheet or the IDEM Fact Sheet on the Region 5 Superfund Web site.

<http://www.epa.gov/region5/superfund/npl/indiana/IND001213503.htm>



Do not Distribute

ELIZABETH MINE

Strafford and Thetford, Vermont

Site Description: The Elizabeth Mine is an abandoned copper and copperas mine located in the towns of Strafford and Thetford, Vermont (population 2,500). The site is in a rural, wooded area with some residential properties bordering it to the west. The site includes about 47 acres of tailing, waste rock, and heap leach piles, over one mile of underground workings, two open bedrock cuts, and a former vent pipe from the mine that is discharging water into the surface water. Surface water contaminated with metals drains into the West Branch Ompompanoosuc River, which in turn flows into the Connecticut River. Additionally, EPA found contamination in one residential water well. The well is no longer in use and the residents have relocated. All of the other residential wells in the area were sampled and found to meet federal and state primary drinking water standards. No other threats to human health have been identified. EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to human health at the site based upon a review of the data by ATSDR. There is an immediate and ongoing significant impact to the environment as a result of the acid mine drainage.

Current Site Status: EPA signed an Action Memorandum for a Non-Time-Critical Removal Action (NTCRA) on September 3, 2002 to address the discharge of acid mine drainage from the tailings, heap leach piles, and waste rock. EPA will continue to monitor the site to ensure there is no immediate threat to human health pending the start of long-term cleanup work.

Current Funding Status: Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to human health. The NTCRA will address the immediate threat to the environment caused by the acid mine drainage. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.

Overall Environmental Progress and EPA Actions: EPA has spent more than \$3million to investigate the contamination at the Elizabeth Mine. To determine the extent of the contamination, EPA sampled mine tailings, surface water, sediment, fish tissues, ground water, and drinking water supplies. Parallel to this investigation, EPA conducted an assessment of the historic significance of the mine and concluded that the site is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This requires EPA to avoid or minimize impacts to historic features of the site in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

To help local residents fully participate in the cleanup process, EPA provided the community with independent technical experts through the Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) and the

Technical Outreach Services to Communities (TOSC) programs. These experts reviewed EPA's documents and helped explain EPA's actions to the community so it could assist in determining the appropriate cleanup of the mine. EPA's Superfund Redevelopment Initiative also awarded the Towns of Strafford and Thetford a Superfund Redevelopment Initiative Grant to help the community identify and plan for future uses of this Superfund site.

EPA Funding Process: EPA funds cleanup work at sites that fall into three categories: sites that pose immediate danger to human health or the environment, sites where specific cleanup projects have already begun, and sites where new cleanup projects could be started. Sites that fall into the first two categories are the highest priority to receive funding. Sites in the third category receive funding based on the availability of funds, the relative risk to human health and the environment as determined in part by the National Risk-Based Priority Panel, and other programmatic factors including the potential availability of responsible parties to conduct the work.

For more information on this site, please read the Elizabeth Mine Fact Sheet on the Region 1 Superfund Web site.

<http://www.epa.gov/ne/superfund/sites/elizmine>



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Do not Distribute

HART CREOSOTING COMPANY

Jasper, Texas

Site Description: Hart Creosote, a 442 acre site located in Jasper, TX (population 7,000), used creosote to steam condition and pressure treat wood from 1958 until May 1993. These operations contaminated the soil, surface water and groundwater with polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), posing a threat to two public and 39 private wells used for drinking water and irrigation by approximately 12,000 people. Forests border the site to the north and south, an automotive detailing business is to the east, and a creek runs along the west side of the site. Approximately 1,000 people live within a one-mile radius of the site.

Current Site Status: EPA continues to monitor the site to ensure there is no immediate threat to human health or the environment pending the start of long-term cleanup work.

Current Funding Status: Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to either human health or the environment. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.

Overall Environmental Progress and EPA Actions: EPA has spent more than \$1.5 million to limit human exposure to contaminated soil and water. In September 1995, EPA's emergency response and removal program drained four of the five systems that contained contaminated waste, and prevented the spread of any remaining waste by placing it in a secure, temporary storage pit. EPA then covered the pit with topsoil, and grass seed, and installed six-foot high fence to prevent people from entering the area. Signs warning people of the site's potential danger were also posted on the fence. These steps prevent the waste from spreading to the nearby water wells.

In September 2001, EPA proposed to begin cleaning the creek to the west of the site and to do further work on the waste pit. These actions will contain more of the contaminated soil and prevent the spread of contaminated water. Finally, EPA is investigating the full extent of the site's contamination to determine the best and most appropriate long-term cleanup plans for the site.

EPA Funding Process: EPA funds cleanup work at sites that fall into three categories: sites that pose immediate danger to human health or the environment, sites where specific cleanup projects have already begun, and sites where new cleanup projects could be started. Sites that fall into the first two categories are the highest priority to receive funding. Sites in the third category receive funding based on the availability of funds, the relative risk to human health and the environment

as determined in part by the National Risk-Based Priority Panel, and other programmatic factors including the potential availability of responsible parties to conduct the work.

For more information on this site, please read the Hart Creosoting Company Fact Sheet on the Region 6 Superfund Web site. <http://www.epa.gov/earth1r6/6sf/pdffiles/hart.pdf> .



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Do not Distribute

JASPER CREOSOTING COMPANY

Jasper, Texas

Site Description: Jasper Creosote, an 11 acre site located in Jasper, TX (population 7,000), is an abandoned creosote plant in a mixed rural and suburban area with one occupied residence on the site and nine residences adjacent to it. The site is bounded on the east by the Burlington Northern & Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway, on the west by N. McQueen Street, to the south by State Highway 776, and on the north by the inactive Louisiana Pacific Lumber Yard. From 1946 until 1992, the facility discharged wastewater from the wood treatment process directly into an off-site drainage ditch, contaminating the soil, sediment, and groundwater with semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), pentachlorophenol (PCP) and dioxins/furans. The groundwater contaminated the Jasper Aquifer, which serves as the drinking water supply for the City of Jasper, although not in the immediate area of the city's wells.

Current Site Status: EPA continues to monitor the site to ensure there is no immediate threat to human health or the environment pending the start of long-term cleanup work.

Current Funding Status: Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to either human health or the environment. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.

Overall Environmental Progress and EPA Actions: EPA has spent more than \$1 million to limit human exposure to contaminated soil and water. In 1996, EPA completed a time-critical removal action to dismantle tanks and structures, remove liquid wastes and contaminated soils from around the process area and consolidate most of the remaining, less contaminated soils in and near the process area. A chain link fence was installed around the covered waste cell following final grading. This action has reduced the risk to trespassers at the site. In September 2000, EPA initiated an investigation to determine the extent of contamination in the wetland area and the on-site waste cell.

In September 2001, EPA proposed to begin cleaning a wetland to the east of the site and proposed to do thermal desorption on the waste pit. These actions will contain more of the contaminated soil and prevent the spread of contaminated water. Finally, EPA is investigating the full extent of the site's contamination to determine the best and most appropriate long-term cleanup plans for the site.

EPA Funding Process: EPA funds cleanup work at sites that fall into three categories: sites that pose immediate danger to human health or the environment, sites where specific cleanup projects

have already begun, and sites where new cleanup projects could be started. Sites that fall into the first two categories are the highest priority to receive funding. Sites in the third category receive funding based on the availability of funds, the relative risk to human health and the environment as determined in part by the National Risk-Based Priority Panel, and other programmatic factors including the potential availability of responsible parties to conduct the work.

For more information on this site, please read the Jasper Creosoting Company Fact Sheet on the Region 6 Superfund Web site. <http://www.epa.gov/earth1r6/6sf/pdf/jasper.pdf>



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Do not Distribute

JENNISON-WRIGHT CORPORATION

Granite City, Illinois

Site Description: The Jennison-Wright Corporation site, a 20-acre site in Granite City, IL, (population 33,000), treated railroad ties from 1921 through 1989. Located in a mixed industrial and residential area, when the facility closed, waste was left on-site in a railroad tank car, a buried railroad tank car, two aboveground storage tanks, and two lagoons, contaminating surface water with creosote, pentachlorophenol, and other related substances.

Current Site Status: EPA continues to monitor the site to ensure there is no immediate threat to human health or the environment pending the start of long-term cleanup work.

Current Funding Status: Through actions already taken at this site, EPA has determined that there is no immediate risk to either human health or the environment. EPA will consider funding new work at this site in Fiscal Year 2003.

Overall Environmental Progress and EPA Actions: EPA has spent more than \$2.3 million to limit exposure to the contaminated water at the site. In 1992 and 1994, with funding from both the U.S. EPA and the Jennison-Wright Corporation bankruptcy sale, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) took steps to prevent the waste from spreading, then disposed of it off-site. In July 1999, U.S. EPA completed its study of the impacts of the site contamination and with IEPA, in September 1999, released the long-term cleanup plan. The plan specifies treating the contaminated soil by using an on-site biological treatment land-farm and treating groundwater using a steam injection/NAPL recovery system.

EPA Funding Process: EPA funds cleanup work at sites that fall into three categories: sites that pose immediate danger to human health or the environment, sites where specific cleanup projects have already begun, and sites where new cleanup projects could be started. Sites that fall into the first two categories are the highest priority to receive funding. Sites in the third category receive funding based on the availability of funds, the relative risk to human health and the environment as determined in part by the National Risk-Based Priority Panel, and other programmatic factors including the potential availability of responsible parties to conduct the work.

For more information on this site, please read the Jennison-Wright Corporation Fact Sheet on the Region 5 Superfund Web site.

<http://www.epa.gov/region5/superfund/npl/illinois/ILD006282479.htm>