

Re: USEPA Feasibility Study of Remedial Alternatives for the Koppers Superfund Site (May 2010)

Madam Mayor, Madam Chair, City and County Commissioners,

Although the probabilistic models in USEPA's Feasibility Study of Remedial Alternatives dated May 2010 allow for alternative risk assessment scenarios in the future, the document in hand continues to use risk assessments and proposed remedies grounded upon presumed future site-wide commercial/industrial use.

**1.3.7.1 Potential Receptors.** . . . The use of the Site is anticipated to remain commercial/industrial in the future, though it is possible that portions of the Site could be developed for other purposes (e.g., recreational) as well. . . . Reasonable future receptors include on-Site workers and recreational users.

On-Site residential exposure scenarios are not applicable based on the expected commercial/industrial and/or recreational use of the property. Evaluation of potential risks associated with nonresidential use scenarios is consistent with federal guidance (EPA, 1995), in which EPA proposes to address potential risks consistent with current and plausible future land-use patterns. Note that this assumption does not prevent consideration of future Site development that does include residential use. Future residential site development would need to address the appropriate potential exposure pathways as part of the development design (see Section 1.5).

Even the most "updated" version of the on-site Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) continues to presume future commercial/industrial use of the site. Please see excerpt below from the cover letter sent on behalf of Beazer East to Scott Miller (EPA) dated May 10, 2010:

Dear Scott,

On behalf of Beazer East, ARCADIS is sending the attached update . . .

1. The updated HHRA assumes that the Site is currently vacant with hypothetical trespassers as the current hypothetical receptors with potential theoretical exposure to constituents on-Site;
2. The updated HHRA assumes that in the future the Site may be developed for hypothetical recreational or commercial/industrial use and that the hypothetical receptors in those cases are hypothetical recreational users or hypothetical indoor or outdoor commercial/industrial workers;
3. Given that the Site is currently vacant and that exact nature of future development is not defined, the updated HHRA treats the Site as one hypothetical exposure area; and,
4. US EPA theoretical default assumptions are used to evaluate the potential theoretical health risks for hypothetical future commercial/industrial workers. . . .

Best regards,

Paul Anderson

Robert Pearce