March 31, 2016
The responses to the questions posted are in italic.

Note: Not all the numbers of the pictures listed below "matched" the numbers on the pictures we received; therefore, we did the best we could trying to answer all the questions.

Picture 1 and 2 (close up) – Appears to be uncontrolled erosion on embankment. *Pictures 1 & 3.*
2016-02-22 Q 1 Is it evidence of partial embankment failure? *See Q1-4 below.*
2016-02-22 Q 2 If uncorrected could it cause structural failure? *See Q1-4 below.*
2016-02-22 Q 3 Repair required? If yes, when? *See Q1-4 below.*
2016-02-22 Q 4 Adequate Design? *See Q1-4 below.*
2016-02-22 Q 5 How long has the grass been in place? *If asking about the vegetation on the park slope by the Wissahickon Creek, it has been there since summer 2009. The vegetation on the top of the slope since fall 2015.*

Q1-4: *There is no partial embankment failure or structural failure along park slope by the Wissahickon Creek. When soil was added to bring the park to the design elevations, it caused the runoff to go over the top of the slopes at the park, during rain events and also when the snow melted. We recently added erosion and sedimentation controls along the perimeter of the park.*

As part of the final design for the park, a swale will be constructed around the entire park perimeter in order to control future runoff. In addition, once the vegetation takes, the runoff should not be a problem. We will continue to monitor the area to ensure there are no additional runoff issues.

Map number 1 - location of erosion in picture 1 as well as location of picture 4
Picture 4 and 5 (close up) - appears to be asbestos pipe at base of tree on edge of creek. Note: It looks very similar to the piece in picture #19. Theoretical relationship discussed with picture 19.
2016-02-22 Q 6 If asbestos, is clean up needed and by whom?

As the CAG knows, we have been doing a creek cleanup every spring along the creek, from Mount Pleasant down to the WVWA offices. Each year we see less and less pieces of ACM; however, as explained before, every time there is a big storm event more pieces of ACM seem to "pop up" from the sediments and are deposited along the creek banks.

We conducted an ACM creek cleanup on 3/31/16. ACM pieces able to be picked up by hand or easily removed by shovel were removed from the creek, double bagged and then put in the on-site roll-off container for proper off-site disposal.

Picture 6 - appears to be soil falling off of steep sloped embankment. *Picture 10 – park slope by the confluence of the Wissahickon and Rose Valley . . . see Q1-4 above.*
2016-02-22 Q 7 Is it evidence of partial embankment failure? *See Q1-4 above.*
2016-02-22 Q 8 If uncorrected could it cause structural failure? *See Q1-4 above.*
2016-02-22 Q 9 Repair required? If yes, when? *See Q1-4 above.*
2016-02-22 Q 10 Adequate Design? *See Q1-4 above.*
2016-02-22 Q 11 How long has the grass been in place? *In that specific area, since fall 2015.*

Picture 7 and 8 (close up) - appears to be runoff from corner of berm of reservoir. *Picture 11 & 12 – outside slope of the pond, by the Wissahickon. The vegetation on top of the berm was not thick enough to stop/reduce the runoff from precipitation and snow melting, which caused some erosion on the slope. As shown on the picture, we had installed wattles ("straw socks") to prevent it, but it did not work well. Once the vegetation takes, that should not be a problem. We will continue to monitor the area to ensure there are no additional runoff issues. The area on the slope had been repaired.*

2016-02-22 Q 12 Why is water running off of the reservoir berm versus the deigned overflow? *The designed overflow outfall is for when the water in the pond is too high, not for runoff.*

2016-02-22 Q 13 Is it evidence of partial reservoir berm failure? *No, it is not evidence of partial reservoir berm failure . . . that is just superficial.*

2016-02-22 Q 14 If uncorrected could it cause structural berm failure? *Perhaps not so much as structural berm failure, but the erosion rill would get deeper/bigger.*

2016-02-22 Q 15 Repair required? If yes, when? *Yes, as stated above, it was repaired.*

2016-02-22 Q 16 Adequate Design? *Yes*

2016-02-22 Q 17 How long has the grass been in place? *In that specific area, since fall 2015.*

Picture 11 and 14- appears to be middle of reservoir berm slippage and danger warning sign damaged. Note: This danger warning sign has been knocked over for more than 12 months. Apologies for not reporting sooner.

2016-02-22 Q 18 Is it evidence of partial reservoir berm failure? *Picture 15 – outside slope of the pond, by the Wissahickon Creek. No, it is not evidence of partial reservoir berm failure. This is an area where the top of berm has new vegetation (from when the inside berm and the top were done last fall) and the vegetation along the outside slope was pushed down by snow, causing the appearance of slipping slope.*

2016-02-22 Q 19 If uncorrected could it cause structural failure? *There is nothing to be corrected.*

2016-02-22 Q 20 Repair required? If yes, when? *There is nothing to be corrected.*

2016-02-22 Q 21 Adequate Design? *Yes*

2016-02-22 Q 22 How long has the grass been in place? *At the top of the slope since last fall and along the outside slope since summer 2010.*

2016-02-22 Q 23 Last time perimeter signs were inspected? *We checked them after we received this document.*

2016-02-22 Q 24 Do the current perimeter warning signs meet the design specification? *Not sure what the question means, but all areas where ACM was exposed have been covered; therefore, the "do not create dust" signs are no longer needed, per NESHAPs regulations.*

Picture 13 and 12 (close up), 17,20 appears to be pieces of asbestos pipe on creek side.

2016-02-22 Q 25 If asbestos, is clean up needed and by whom? *See answer for "Picture 4 and 5 (close up)" above.*

Picture 18 – Appears to be piece of asbestos pipe on adjacent property. Next to surveyor's stake.

2016-02-22 Q 26 If asbestos, is clean up needed and by whom? *See answer for "Picture 4 and 5 (close up)" above.*

Map number 4 location of possible asbestos pipe pieces in woods in picture 18.

Picture 19 - Appears to be piece of asbestos pipe at base of tree.

2016-02-22 Q 27 If asbestos, is clean up needed and by whom? *See answer for "Picture 4 and 5 (close up)" above.*

2016-02-22 Q 28 Was this used as a planter to plant the tree many years ago? *No idea . . . see answer for "Picture 4 and 5 (close up)" above.*

2016-02-22 Q 29 Did it create an unstable foundation for the tree? *No idea . . . see answer for "Picture 4 and 5 (close up)" above.*

Picture 22 and 23 - Appears to be slippage of berm embankment near side edge of storage can. *Picture 27 – no slippage. This is another area where top of berm has new vegetation and the vegetation along the slope was pushed down by snow, causing the appearance of slipping slope.*

2016-02-22 Q 30 Is it evidence of partial embankment failure? *N/A, see above.*

2016-02-22 Q 31 If uncorrected could it cause structural failure? *N/A, see above.*

2016-02-22 Q 32 Repair required? If yes, when? *N/A, see above.*

2016-02-22 Q 33 Adequate Design? *Yes.*

2016-02-22 Q 34 Is the storage can creating excessive or point source sheet run off? *No.*

2016-02-22 Q 35 Who owns the storage can? *Rented equipment.*

Picture 25 appears to be large soil pile. *Picture 29 – topsoil pile*

2016-02-22 Q 36 Are silt fence, off site material control measures required? *As stated on Q1-4 above, we recently added erosion and sedimentation controls along the perimeter of the park.*

2016-02-22 Q 37 Are silt fence, off site material control measures in place? *See above.*

2016-02-22 Q 38 What prevents the soil from migrating off site? *See above.*

Picture 31 - appears to be newly dumped debris. *Picture 35 – that material was pushed to that area during snow plowing of the access road . . . it is all gravel.*

2016-02-22 Q 39 Is this new dumped material? *See above.*

2016-02-22 Q 40 Who owns it? *Site material.*

2016-02-22 Q 41 Silt fence required to prevent runoff? *As stated above, it was all gravel, which was pushed back on driveway area.*

2016-02-22 Q 42 Is it asbestos? *See above.*

Picture 32 - BORIT entrance gate.

Picture 34 and 35/36 – appears to be erosion failure of embankment greater than 12 inch deep soil. This is below the adjacent BORIT area in picture 33. *Picture 39 & 40 . . . see Q1-4 above. In addition, in that corner was where the retention pond was, meaning that most of the runoff was flowing to that corner. A combination of all that caused the landslide at that corner. When the park remediation is all complete, the design elevations will properly handle storm water runoff.*

2016-02-22 Q 43 Is it evidence of partial embankment structural failure? If yes, Why? *See above.*

2016-02-22 Q 44 Is it evidence of partial embankment aesthetic failure? If yes, Why? *See above.*

2016-02-22 Q 45 Repair required? If yes, when? *Yes, the contractor will repair the slope and the subcontractors will repair garden beds the week of April 4th.*

2016-02-22 Q 46 Adequate Design? For the slope, yes. *As stated above, as part of the final design for the park, a swale will be constructed around the entire park area in order to control future runoff.*

Picture 37 and 38 – Hole adjacent sidewalk above the Tannery Run Creek. *Picture 41.*
2016-02-22 Q 47 Is it evidence of failure? If yes, Why? *The hole in sidewalk is not associated with structural aspects of the site.*
2016-02-22 Q 48 Repair required? If yes, when? *That is the Borough's responsibility.*
2016-02-22 Q 49 Who owns the space adjacent the sidewalk? *See above.*
2016-02-22 Q 50 Did BORIT activity cause the hole? *Not likely. The bridge on Maple (above Tannery Run) has been in poor condition since work first began at the site.*
2016-02-22 Q 51 What other damage is on the BORIT site? *None that we are aware of.*

Picture 39 – appears to be erosion from McDonald's site. *Picture 43*
2016-02-22 Q 52 Is this sheet water run-off from the McDonald's parking lot? *Yes.*
2016-02-22 Q 53 If uncorrected could it cause structural embankment failure? *Not likely, but possible.*
2016-02-22 Q 54 Repair required? If yes, when? *Yes, we will install erosion and sedimentation control in that area.*
2016-02-22 Q 55 Adjacent property runoff accounted for in design of this embankment? *Yes, however, that particular area had an actual wall, which was demolished recently.*
2016-02-22 Q 56 Who is responsible to repair BORIT site damage? *For now EPA, once EPA is done the future operation and maintenance (O&M) would be a shared responsibility between the state and the respective property owners.*

Picture 40 – BORIT entrance gate appears to have water runoff and mud in street from site. *Picture 44*
2016-02-22 Q 57 Is site control required to prevent soil/material runoff? *See Q1-4 above.*
2016-02-22 Q 58 Why is there mud in the entry driveway? *During that time the contractor was working on extending the utilities up the main entrance at the site; therefore, there was some soil disturbance in the days prior to the rain events, which caused the muddy water on the alley. The mud is from the clean fill material, which has been imported to the site.*
2016-02-22 Q 59 Truck decontamination/capture system required? *Actual decontamination is conducted when waste is handled. During rain events, some areas get muddy and that is how some mud is tracked onto the alley . . . from personal vehicles going in and out of the site. When needed, we have a subcontractor that comes and cleans the street.*
2016-02-22 Q 60 Adequate entry/exit design to prevent site material migration? *See answers above. In addition, since then, the main entrance was finished and covered with gravel again.*

Picture 42 and 43 – Appears to be broken and deflected fence support stakes and ropes from wind or other environmental factors. *Pictures 46, 47, & 48*
2016-02-22 Q 61 Is the fence required to be supported by stakes and ropes? If yes, Why? *No, the fence is not required to be supported by stakes and ropes. That was done because the fence was falling into street when first set up.*
2016-02-22 Q 62 Repair required? If yes, when? *A permanent fence will be installed in April 2016.*
2016-02-22 Q 63 When last inspected by fence company? *The fence is inspected by site personnel, not the fence company.*
2016-02-22 Q 64 Adequate Design? *N/A*

General questions about the pictures

2016-02-22 Q 65 Did all the items identified occur in the last 30 days? *All the erosion related issues occurred in late February. February was a wet month . . . we got approximately 4.5 inches of rain, on top of approximately 4 inches of snow.*

The ACM along the stream banks has been and will continue to be an ongoing issue.

2016-02-22 Q 66 Who is the current management team onsite? *The same as before.*

2016-02-22 Q 67 Names? Titles? Organization structure? *All that information is on the website.*

2016-02-22 Q 68 When was the last time a Corporate Env., Health and Safety Professional from one of the contractors or other third party qualified inspector perform a physical onsite inspection? *Different local, state and federal agencies stop by frequently. Personnel from the contractors' corporate offices were on-site last year (2015).*

General site questions

2016-02-22 Q 69 Do all onsite control methods account for several inches of frozen soil? *Yes.*

2016-02-22 Q 70 When was the last time the BORIT was physically inspected by any party? *The site personnel conduct daily on-site inspections.*

2016-02-22 Q 71 Who inspected it? *See above.*

2016-02-22 Q 72 Was it documented? *Everything is documented by taking pictures and entries in the logbooks.*

2016-02-22 Q 73 Is the report available? *No, there is no actual report.*

2016-02-22 Q 74 Any corrective identified? *Yes, everything was explained above.*

2016-02-22 Q 75 Do the aerial photos validate any item identified in this report? *On the aerial photos you can see the sequence of the work at the site, as well of the snow fall and precipitation . . . if you combine all that, you can say it validates what was stated in this document.*