



"Yeh, Laura (NFESC)"

07/30/2004 09:34 PM

To <gwtf@emsus.com>

cc

bcc

Subject FW: discussions of DNAPL fates and policy

It's an excellent discussion paper, without saying, OF COURSE IT IS. covers all points that I have heard raised, except for prevention of source contamination. Will this all lead to RCRA permit restrictions? Mark Mercer at the EPA could argue with/for me, for a while and a half.\*\*

I was reading the Options -- very interesting, as I have also been looking at new vehicles to purchase -- all sorts of options.....

I think there should be a general tie in to site conceptual models and/or RCRA permits, fr the point of view that, a continuing leak, and worker safety hazards in general, are reasons, that companies refuse to invest in contamination that is already in the ground. MCLS will never be met, when an operational line is still leaking.

Site conceptual models are old and basic..... no one will disagree, with those principles of how to find your contamination and then treat it (option 5). I thk that the public will be happy with the policy options, very much. Go the 100,000 mile warranty!

Laura Yeh, PE  
Naval Facilities Engineering Service Ctr  
1100 23rd Ave.  
Port Hueneme, CA 93043-4370  
(805) 982-1660; FAX (805) 982-4304

\*(re) injection of (D)NAPL mass removed is allowed in some states?????