

## Contents of Compact Disk

### Union Pacific's Comments on EPA's "Proposed Plan, Residential Yard Soils, Omaha Lead Site, Omaha, Nebraska" (July 16, 2004)

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. GENERAL COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1) None of the Alternatives Evaluated in the Proposed Plan Will Accomplish the Remedial Action Objective or Regulatory Requirements for a Remedy.....	3
2) EPA Has Not Recognized or Identified the Multiple Sources of Child Lead Exposure at the Omaha Lead Site .....	4
3) The Comprehensive Program is the Preferred Remedy .....	7
4) A Comprehensive Program Can Legally Be the Remedy or an Integral Component of the Remedy.....	8
5) An Interim Record of Decision Is Appropriate At This Time.....	9
6) EPA Did Not Comply with Statutory and Regulatory Requirements or Guidance In Many Material Respects Concerning the Site .....	10
7) All Potentially Responsible Parties at the Site Must Be Identified and Have a Meaningful Opportunity to Participate in the Site Investigation and Remedy Selection Process.....	11
8) The Community Has Not Had a Meaningful Opportunity for Involvement .....	13
9) The Data Supporting EPA's Proposed Plan Do Not Meet Data Quality Requirements and Do Not Define the Nature and Extent of Site Lead Contamination .....	14
<b>III. SPECIFIC COMMENTS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
1) Site Background.....	15
2) Site Characteristics.....	16
3) Scope and Role of Response Action.....	16
4) Summary of Site Risks .....	17
5) Determination of Preliminary Soil Clean Up Goals .....	17
6) Evaluation of Alternatives .....	18
7) Preferred Alternative.....	20
<b>IV. CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>23</b>

### Union Pacific's Comments on EPA's "Remedial Investigation, Residential Yard Soil, Omaha Lead Site, Omaha, Nebraska" (June 9, 2004)

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. GENERAL COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1) EPA Has Not Identified All Significant Lead Exposures at the Site.....	1
2) EPA's Conceptual Model Is Fundamentally Flawed.....	2

3) EPA’s Air Dispersion Model Does Not Support EPA’s Conclusions.....	3
4) EPA Has Not Effectively Speciated Sources of Lead in Site Soil.....	9
5) EPA’s Bioavailability Samples Were Strongly Influenced by Paint.....	10
6) EPA’s Demographic Study Overlooked a Number of Material Issues.....	11
7) ATSDR’s Public Health Assessment Was Based Upon Incomplete Data and EPA’s Inaccurate Site Conceptual Model; Its Conclusions Do Not Support the RI.....	12
8) EPA Did Not Follow Its Own Guidance Documents to Prepare the RI.....	13
<b>III. SPECIFIC COMMENTS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
1) Executive Summary .....	13
2) Executive Summary .....	13
3) Executive Summary .....	15
4) Section 1.1, Purpose of Report.....	15
5) Section 1.2.1, Site Description .....	15
6) Section 1.2.2, Site History.....	15
7) Section 1.2.2, Site History.....	16
8) Section 1.2.3, Miscellaneous Previous Investigations.....	16
9) Section 1.2.3, Miscellaneous Previous Investigations.....	16
10) Section 1.2.3, Miscellaneous Previous Investigations.....	19
11) Section 1.2.5 Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection.....	19
12) Section 1.2.6, ATSDR Health Consultations.....	19
13) Section 1.2.7, Douglas County Health Department.....	20
14) Section 1.2.8, Apportionment Study.....	20
15) Sections 1.2.9 and 1.2.10, Bioavailability Study & In-Vitro Bioavailability Sample Analysis .....	21
16) Section 2.0, Remedial Investigation Methods.....	22
17) Section 2.1, Soil Sampling.....	25
18) Section 2.2, Dust Sampling and Demographic Survey.....	26
19) Section 4.0, Nature and Extent of Contamination .....	26
20) Section 4.1, Data Validation .....	27
21) Section 4.2, Nature and Extent of Contamination .....	28
22) Section 4.3, Dust Sampling.....	31
23) Section 4.4, Presence of Arsenic.....	35
24) Section 5.0, Contaminant Fate and Transport.....	35
25) Section 6.0, Summary and Conclusions.....	36
26) Section 6.1.2, Fate and Transport.....	37
27) Section 6.2, Recommendations.....	37

28) Appendix C, Socio-Demographics and Land Use and Activity Patterns Report .....	37
29) Appendix D, National Exposure Research Laboratory (NERL) and University of Colorado Laboratory for Environmental and Geological Studies (LEGS) Lead and Arsenic Reports (Arsenic and Lead Contamination in Soils – Omaha Nebraska).....	38
30) Appendix F, In Vitro Bioassay Report .....	38
31) Appendix G, Field Sampling Plans (Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Field Sampling Plan Addendum (BVSPC, January 2004)) .....	38

**Union Pacific’s Comments on EPA’s “Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment, Omaha Lead Superfund Site, Omaha, Nebraska” (June 2004)**

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. GENERAL COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1) The HHRA Does Not Comply With CERCLA or the NCP .....	2
2) The HHRA is Based Upon the Incorrect Premise That Industrial Sources Are the Only Sources of Lead at the Site .....	3
3) Omaha Lead Site Blood Lead Levels Mirror National Trends Showing a Steady Decline in Blood Lead Elevations Casting Doubt on the Need for the Massive Soil Excavation Remedy Proposed by EPA .....	4
4) A Recent HUD Study Indicates that Soil Removal Alone Will Not Appreciably Reduce Children’s Blood Lead Levels.....	4
5) Application of the IEUBK Model and Use of Actual Blood Lead Data.....	5
6) The IEUBK Modeling Was Improperly Conducted at the OLS .....	6
7) The Site Data Set Has Many Gaps and Usability Problems.....	7
<b>III. SPECIFIC COMMENTS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1) Section 1.1, Site Description.....	9
2) Section 1.2, Basis for Potential Concern .....	9
3) Section 1.3, Scope of the Risk Assessment.....	10
4) Section 2.1.1.1, Remedial Soils Site Characterization Data Set.....	10
5) Section 2.1.1.2, IEUBK Lead Risk Model Paired Outdoor Soil and Interior Dust Data Set.....	15
6) Section 2.1.2, Interior Dust .....	21
7) Section 2.1.3, Ambient Air.....	22
8) Section 2.1.4, Tap Water, and Table 2-5.....	22
9) Section 2.2, Selection of Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPCs).....	23
10) Section 3.1, Conceptual Site Model.....	23
11) Section 3.4 , Demographic Study.....	24
12) Section 4.2, Overview of the IEUBK Model .....	25
13) Section 4.3, Risk Characterization for Lead.....	34

14) Section 4.4, Uncertainty Analysis for Lead .....	39
15) Other HHRA Issues .....	40

**Union Pacific’s Comments on EPA’s “Feasibility Study,  
Omaha Lead Site, Omaha, Nebraska” (June 2004)**

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. GENERAL COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1) The Feasibility Study Does Not Meet Minimum Regulatory Requirements .....	2
2) Lead Sources Have Not Been Identified or Sufficiently Evaluated to Develop Alternatives or Perform an Alternatives Analysis Consistent with NCP Section 300.430(e) .....	3
3) Financial/Cost Information Does Not Meet Statutory and Regulatory Requirements.....	4
4) The FS Glosses Over the Risks Presented by Increased Truck Traffic.....	5
5) The FS Should Have Recognized the Work Being Done in the Community and Proposed a Comprehensive Program Alternative to Effectively Coordinate These Efforts.....	6
<b>III. SPECIFIC COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1) Section 1.0, Introduction.....	6
2) Sections 1.2.1, Site Location and Description and 1.2.2 Operational History and Waste Characteristics .....	7
3) Section 1.2.3, Nature and Extent of Contamination .....	9
4) Section 1.2.4, Contaminant Fate and Transport .....	9
5) Section 1.2.5, Baseline Risk Assessment.....	10
6) Section 2.0, Potential Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements.....	10
7) Section 3.0, Identification and Screening of Technologies .....	12
8) Section 4.0, Identification of Applicable Technologies and Process Options .....	12
9) Section 4.2, Excavation and Disposal.....	12
10) Section 4.3, Capping Technologies .....	14
11) Section 4.5, Actions to Address Other Non-Soil Sources of Lead.....	14
12) Section 5.0, Development of Alternatives .....	15
13) Section 5.1.2, Alternative 2: Excavation with Health Education and Institutional Controls.....	16
14) Section 5.1.3, Alternative 3: Phosphate Stabilization and Excavation with Health Education and Institutional Controls .....	17
15) Section 5.1.4, Alternative 4: Interim Excavation with Treatability Study, Health Education, and Institutional Controls .....	17
16) Section 6.0, Detailed Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives .....	18
17) Section 6.2.2, Alternative 2: Excavation with Health Education and Institutional Controls .....	18

18) Section 6.2.3, Alternative 3: Phosphate Stabilization and Excavation with Health Education and Institutional Controls .....	20
19) Section 6.2.4, Alternative 4: Interim Excavation with Treatability Study, Health Education, and Institutional Controls.....	21
20) Section 7.0, Comparative Analysis of Alternatives .....	22

### List of Attachments

- Attachment A. Frequently Cited Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Lead Guidance
- Attachment B. Kids, Houses, and Dirt: Finding Out What We Know About Lead Exposures (Leinenkugel, 2002)
- Attachment C. Comprehensive Program Elements
- Attachment D. Paint as a Source of Recontamination of Houses in Urban Environments and Its Role in Maintaining Elevated Blood Leads in Children (Gulson et al., 1995)
- Attachment E. Applicability of a Kids First Program to the Omaha Lead Site (MFG, 2004)
- Attachment F. Historic Articles Regarding the Construction of Omaha's North Freeway
- Attachment G. Historic Information and Articles Regarding Pesticide Use in Omaha
- Attachment H. Historic Information Regarding the City of Omaha's Relationship to the Omaha Lead Site
- Attachment I. Executive Order Facilitation of Cooperative Conservation (August 2004)
- Attachment J. Information Package, National Remedy Review Board Meeting, Kansas City, Kansas (March 2004)
- Attachment K. Listing of Potential Industrial Sources for the Omaha Lead Site
- Attachment L. Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) Map for the Omaha Lead Site
- Attachment M. Air Modeling Discussion
- Attachment N. Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) Data
- Attachment O. Applicability of Bioavailability Data for the Omaha Lead Site
- Attachment P. U.S. Cities Blood Lead Map
- Attachment Q. IEUBK Model Articles
- Attachment R. Limited Speciation of Lead in Residential Soils of Omaha, Nebraska (September 2004)
- Attachment S. Union Pacific's Comments on EPA's April 4, 2002 "A Study on the Source of Anomalous Lead Concentration in Soils from the Omaha Community – Omaha, Nebraska"
- Attachment T. Union Pacific's Comments on EPA's April 2003 "Relative Bioavailability of Lead in Test Materials from a Superfund Site in Omaha, Nebraska"
- Attachment U. Union Pacific's Comments on the EPA's "Demographic and Land Use Survey"
- Attachment V. Omaha World-Herald Article (June 1997)
- Attachment W. Union Pacific's Comments on the EPA's July 28, 2003 "Draft Field Sampling Plan for the Omaha Lead Refining Site, Omaha Lead Site"
- Attachment X. Comments on EPA's March 19, 1999 "Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) Omaha Lead Refining Site Investigation, Omaha, Nebraska, Revision 1, Volume 1"
- Attachment Y. Lead-Based Paint & Tap Water Investigation (October 2004)