



**REGION 5**  
CHICAGO, IL 60604

March 17, 2025

Mr. John Jolly  
Senior Environmental Manager  
NCR Voyix  
3091 Satellite Boulevard, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Duluth, Georgia 30096  
[john.jolly@ncrvoyix.com](mailto:john.jolly@ncrvoyix.com)

RE: *United States of America and The State of Michigan v. NCR Corporation* (Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-1041); OU5 Area 4 Removal Work Plan Draft for 'Part 2'; Allied Paper, Inc./Portage Creek/Kalamazoo River Superfund Site

Dear Mr. Jolly:

This letter identifies omissions, corrections and clarifications for incorporation into the Area 4 TCRA Removal Work Plan 'Part 2,' (work plan) dated October 23, 2024.

EPA provided comments to the work plan, Dam Removal and River Stabilization (DRRS) Design Summary (Appendix A), and design drawings (Appendix B) to NCR Voyix (NCRV) on November 21, 2024. Responses provided by NCRV on December 16, 2024, were taken into consideration in preparing this letter. In addition, EPA has evaluated the modeling of the proposed channel restoration.

Please address the following in your resubmittal of the work plan, DRRS and design drawings:

- The omissions, corrections and clarifications identified in the attachment must be addressed and/or incorporated into the document(s) re-submission.
- The details provided in NCRV's December 16, 2024, response should be incorporated into the document(s) as indicated in the attachment.
- All restored bank slopes constructed above projected dam out normal water surface elevations must be at a 3H:1V slope.

Finally, ensure that the document is reviewed according to Sections 7.6 and 12.3 of the Quality Management Plan (May 2022), which contemplates a technical review, quality assurance review, editorial review and final review, prior to submittal.

Please submit a revised work plan DRRS and corresponding design drawings which incorporate the above input by April 21, 2025.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, contact me at (734) 740-9019 ([kelly.brian@epa.gov](mailto:kelly.brian@epa.gov)) or Paul Ruesch at (312) 919-4382 ([ruesch.paul@epa.gov](mailto:ruesch.paul@epa.gov)).

Sincerely,

Brian Kelly  
On Scene Coordinator  
Emergency Response Branch #1

Attachment

cc: Dan Peabody, EGLE  
Mark Mills, MDNR  
Paul Ruesch, US EPA

## **Attachment. Omissions/Clarifications/Corrections – ‘Part 2’ Workplan Submission**

### **Workplan**

1. Please address the following omissions:
  - a. Provide a high-level proposed schedule for construction activities in Figure 3 (1.3).
  - b. Provide updated sediment transport estimates and limits, including tributaries, considering the design changes (2.1, 4.8).
  - c. Consider the use of turbidity curtain along the river side of temporary cofferdams should they fail to control turbidity (5.1.6).
  - d. Describe how sediment harvested from sediment traps will be managed as described in the 12/16/2024 response and at a conceptual level relating to sediment trap design and management (5.1.6, 5.8.2).
  - e. Describe the site-specific protocols to be used or reference the protocols used in Area 3 for invasive plant and animal species control (5.1.9).
  - f. Describe the approach, details, and/or references directly to the associated design plans for the stream tube removal (5.4.1, 5.4.2).
  - g. Describe the approach to confirmation sampling in 6" bank cut areas and submit the 'Part 2 Confirmation Sampling Plan' as soon as possible (5.4.2, 5.4.3).
  - h. All bank areas, regardless of whether they were subject to removal, must be sampled to ensure PCB concentrations are  $\leq 5$  mg/kg. In addition, if material  $\leq 5$  mg/kg will be used to construct restored bank, this material must be sampled to ensure PCB concentrations are  $\leq 1$  mg/kg, similar to that implemented in Area 3 (5.4.3).
  - i. Provide bank cut depths for each bank grid on a table on Figure 6 or an additional plan view drawing and provide the detail as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.4.2).
  - j. Provide detail on the location(s) of temporary WTSs to be used during bank work as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.4.2).
  - k. Describe the approach and specify the frequency of completed bank removal area monitoring and maintenance as described in the 12/16/2024 response. Consider using an electronic field survey form to document inspections (5.7).
  - l. Provide detail locations of staging/processing (including details on solidification media) of bank soils removed as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.8.1).
  - m. Describe plans for irrigation of stabilized vegetation during the removal (i.e., before the post-removal site control plan is in effect) (5.9).
  - n. Provide detail on the monitoring and maintenance inspection plan, procedures and forms during the removal (i.e., before the post-removal site control plan is in effect) (5.10).
  - o. Provide definition of significant flood event as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.10).
  - p. Add that the water elevation will be lowered incrementally in consultation with MDNR and as approved by EPA (6.0).
  - q. Specify locations and conceptual design details of any proposed sediment traps or clarify as explained in the 12/16/2024 response See 1.d. above (6.3).
  - r. Detail plans for 26<sup>th</sup> Street bridge pre & post-construction inspections and vibration monitoring or incorporate explanation in the 12/16/2024 response (7.3).
  - s. Note that the post-construction monitoring and maintenance time period will be specified by EPA (9.13).
2. Please provide the following clarifications:
  - a. Access roads will be removed as requested by MDNR if approved by EPA (5.1.4).
  - b. Clarify the sequence of removal of temporary riverbank stabilization/containment installed during Part 1 and replacement with temporary cofferdams (5.1.5, 5.4.2).
  - c. Add a summary of anticipated borrow source, backfill sampling frequency/parameters to be included in the CQA for Part 2 (5.1.7, 5.4.4, CQA 4.4).
  - d. Mention that accommodation will be made for split sampling by EPA on WTS effluent (5.1.8).

- e. Refer to the Air Monitoring Plan, Revision 5 (5.2.1), CQA (App. B).
  - f. Mention Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control (SESC) permit application/requirements are submitted to Allegan County HD, which may conduct site visits/inspections (5.3).
  - g. Describe frequency/process/forms (electronic if possible) to be used for SESC inspections (5.3).
  - h. Provide details on the management of any contaminated material if encountered during removal from Schnable Brook.
  - i. Provide a general overview of construction sequencing, water level mgt, temporary coffer dam detail along banks (Subareas C&D) and existing sheet pile (Subarea E) for bank treatment construction as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.4.2).
  - j. State clearly that all bank treatments will tie into the actual alluvial surface encountered during field construction at the bank toe and as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.6.1).
  - k. Specify that all restored bank slopes located above projected dam out normal water surface elevations throughout TCRA reach will be at 3H:1V slopes. The updated surface shows 2H:1V slopes in the targeted widening and lowering areas (5.6.1).
  - l. Refer to the drawing RE-400 showing the 3 bank treatment types (5.6.1).
  - m. Mention how sediments/soils will be evaluated prior to transport and disposal at landfill as described in the 12/16/2024 response.
  - n. Provide additional details on the approach to sampling of materials 'not expected to have PCBs>1' (5.8.2).
    - i. Provide detail on whether the soils/sediments expected to be suitable for vegetation growth as described in the 12/16/2024 response.
    - ii. Note that EPA contractors will be accommodated for independent and split sampling in-line sand separation process.
    - iii. Reference the following correspondence and include an affirmative statement that you will consult with appropriate federal, state, and local agencies as necessary related to reuse of the material (6/25/2024 letter (issue #2), 2/7/2023 meeting, and 2/14/2023 letter).
  - o. State that the pilot channel will be dredged hydraulically as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.8.1).
  - p. State that brick/concrete from demolition debris from the dam and upstream of dam will be placed in scour hole as described in the 12/16/2024 response.
  - q. Since EPA cannot approve reuse of material at other areas of the Site in this document, remove any mention about approval for reuse at other areas of the Site and instead contact the remedial project managers for those areas of the site to discuss next steps on evaluation of proposed reuse options (5.8.2).
  - r. Provide additional detail on the management (i.e., location, staging, dewatering, conditioning, solidification) of bank soils and stream tube sediments, and whether the material will pass through the same separation process to be employed at the SPA in Part 1 (5.8.1.).
  - s. Provide detailed information with references to additional design cross sections requested below, on the restoration of the WCS site and dam corridor (6.2).
  - t. Acknowledge that a LUP for Part 1 was submitted, and a LUP for Part 2 will be needed (7.8).
  - u. Mention that a separate confirmation sampling plan will be developed as described in the 12/16/2024 response (9.5).
  - v. Ensure consistency with the approach to SESC controls/monitoring utilized in Area 3 (9.10).
3. Please incorporate the following corrections:
- a. USFWS S.7 concurrence request submitted on 10/22/2024 (7.5).
  - b. JPA application submitted on 11/1/2024 (7.6).
  - c. Update reference dates (11).

## **DRRS**

1. All figures and tables should be checked and updated, as several appear to be based on past versions of the design.
2. Address discrepancies between the descriptions of changes made to the design and the surfaces provided for review, such as:
  - a. Riffle crest elevations at RM 46.16 were lowered but are not shown in the modeling surface (5.6).
  - b. Riffle crest elevations at RM 46.36 were lowered and shown in the modeling surface but are not stated in the text (5.6).
  - c. Provide clarification on the range of channel widening between RM 46.07 and 46.39, which is stated to be a constant 30', but is shown in the updated design surface to vary from ~15' to ~40' (5.6).
3. Figures that show results from past design iterations should be updated using results from the latest design iteration, for example:
  - a. Elevations are similar but not equal (i.e., the latest 100yr WSE is 2' higher), suggesting the figure may be showing an old design iteration (Fig. 26).
4. Provide the stationing on the Figure 28c and specify the diameter of the "crest stone" for the riffles to facilitate verification of the rock sizing/stability of the riffles (Att. A., Figure 28b, Fig. 28c).

Please provide the following clarifications:

- a. Mention the method/reference(s) for how the 5-7 yr dynamic equilibrium period was determined as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.5).
- b. State that the upstream and downstream extents of riffles will be keyed into the actual alluvial surface encountered during field construction and as described in the 12/16/2024 response (5.3).
- c. State that transitions between bank treatments will be incorporated to ensure stability as described in the 12/16/2024 response (6.0).
- d. Clarify that all restored bank slopes located above projected dam out normal water surface elevations throughout TCRA reach will be at 3H:1V slopes (6.1).
- e. Clarify the change in the specified bank treatment along the LDB (RM46.72 - 46.76) (Fig. 32).
- f. Discuss bank stability given elevated projected velocities in Schnable Brook as described in the 12/16/2024 response (Att. A, Fig. 27b, 27c) and Osgood Drain (Att. A, Fig. 28b, 28c). Either include an explanation as to why these tributaries were not included in the modeling or provide the modeling files.
- g. Clarify that newly constructed banks along Schnable Brook and Osgood Drain will be restored with a biodegradable erosion control blanket and revegetated.
- h. Clarify how it was determined that the 'targeted bed grading' will 'prevent significant sediment mobilization and decrease erosive potential,' as well as how the proposed structures achieve that goal.
- i. Correct the figure to be consistent with the design drawing, as the drawing shows three grade-control structures and the figure shows two (Fig. 27c, RE-213).
- j. Include the note on stable particle size projections as described in the 12/16/2024 response. Include an explanation for how stone sizing was evaluated and assigned for each riffle with associated factors of safety, as the table does not appear to have been used to guide the design (Att. A, Table 13).

## **Design Plans**

1. Please address the following omissions:
  - a. Include the note with a reference on where to find the post-dredge Part 1 elevations as described in the 12/16/2024 response (BC-200).
  - b. Show the bank widening at RM 46.3 (RDB), which is shown on the modeling surface but not on the drawing (BC-203).

- c. Bank widening sections should have a 1:1 (45-degree) transition instead of a 90-degree transition.
  - d. The stream tube extent/detail is not complete and only partially shown on the drawings. Provide clarification and show the full extent(s) of all stream tubes to be removed on the drawings and the cross sections of revised drawings (BC-205/305, 206/306, 307, 308, 309). These drawings should also be referenced in Sections 5.4.1 & 5.4.2 as stated in the workplan omissions.
  - e. Include a plan view showing as clearly as possible the existing banks vs. restored banks in the RE series plan view drawings.
  - f. The Osgood Drain and Schnable Brook tributary drawings should show the slope of the proposed profile (RE-212, RE-213).
2. Please provide the following clarifications:
- a. Ensure the placement of rip rap is necessary above the normal WSE and consider other restoration materials could be constructed closer to the normal WSE so that vegetation extends to the edge of the river (GE-009).
  - b. All restored bank slopes located above projected dam out normal water surface elevations throughout TCRA reach will be at 3H:1V slopes (BC, RE- series drawings).
  - c. Clarify how the contractor will manage bank material where pilot channel footprint extends into banks as described in the 12/16/2024 response (i.e., on BC-205).
  - d. Please correct the drawings to show the full extent of toe scrapes shown by the dark shaded areas along RDB as described in the 12/16/2024 response (BC-205).
  - e. Clarify in detail where sheet pile remains in place after bank restoration and provide an explanation/justification in Section 5.5 of the workplan (RE-101 note 2).
  - f. Show that all riffles will be constructed on coarse subgrade and keyed into the actual alluvial surface encountered during construction (RE-series drawings).
  - g. Add the alluvial surface to the profiles and cross sections (RE-214 to RE-225).
  - h. Show that all toe wood will be installed into the actual alluvial surface encountered during field construction (RE-series drawings).
  - i. Discuss sediment fate/management between pilot channel edges & constructed banks as described in the 12/16/2024 response, providing additional detail on best management practices if the material does not erode, or erodes faster, as expected (RE-207, RE-209, RE-210).
  - j. Provide LDB and RDB restoration sections at RM 44.95 and below the dam to the 26<sup>th</sup> Street bridge.