

September 14, 2026

Greg Braun
Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)
Office of Research & Standards
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Subject: LSPA Comments on *MassDEP Guidance for Disposal Site Risk Characterization*, Chapters 11-13

Dear Mr. Braun:

On behalf of the LSP Association (LSPA), thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft *MassDEP Guidance for Disposal Site Risk Characterization*, Chapters 11 through 13. We appreciate MassDEP's effort to update this guidance and to improve consistency with the 2024 Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP) amendments. The guidance will serve as an important resource for LSPs, risk assessors, and other practitioners responsible for conducting MCP response actions throughout Massachusetts.

Enclosed please find our detailed comments, which are intended to help ensure the final guidance is scientifically sound, practical to implement, and consistent with the MCP and existing risk assessment practices. These comments were informed by Massachusetts LSPs, risk assessors, and other environmental professionals, including members of the LSPA's Regulations Committee and Risk Assessors Subcommittee, and the LSPA's membership more broadly.

As it relates to all the chapters, suggestions were made to help align the guidance with MCP requirements, terminology, and established risk assessment frameworks; improve overall document usability through greater consistency in formatting, figures, abbreviations, and cross-references; and maintain flexibility for professional judgment where site-specific conditions warrant alternative approaches supported by sound technical justification. Chapter-specific comments aim to clarify:

- **Chapter 11:** Exposure assessment, toxicity evaluation, and exposure point concentration methodologies; strengthen guidance for acute and utility worker exposures; and align key concepts with US EPA risk assessment practices.
- **Chapter 12:** Terminology and exposure assessment methods, modernize technical references, and enhance usability. We also recommend removing the proposed section addressing Imminent Hazards to Public Welfare because 310 CMR 40.0955 specifically states that an Imminent Hazard Evaluation is for human health, environment, and safety, and does not include public welfare. Further, the MCP does not specify what criteria need to be evaluated and met for concluding whether an Imminent Hazard to public welfare exists.
- **Chapter 13:** The implementation of Method 3 Ceiling Limit evaluations; provide practical guidance for nuisance odor and public welfare assessments; and address special situations such as coal tar waste deposits and radioactive materials.

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate in this process. The LSPA values its collaboration with MassDEP and welcomes an opportunity to discuss these comments in greater detail.

Sincerely,



Sue Bator, LSP,
GEI Consultants, Inc.; LSPA President



Mariellen Morris
Executive Director, LSPA

Encl.: LSPA Comments on MassDEP Guidance for Disposal Site Risk Characterization, Chapters 11-13

CC: Millie Garcia-Serrano, Assistant Commissioner, MassDEP BWSC; Brian Roden, Acting Director of Policy and Development, MassDEP BWSC

LSPA Comments on MassDEP Guidance for Disposal Site Risk Characterization | Part 2 - Human Health Risk Assessment

Guidance: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/risk-characterization-guidance-chapters-11-13-public-review-draft/download>

Provided below are the LSP Association's detailed comments on the above stated MassDEP Guidance.

***"Page No." refers to the pages in the MassDEP Guidance document.*

***"Section/Subsection" refers to the Sections in the MassDEP Guidance document, unless otherwise noted.*

The LSPA has made every effort to state the issue of concern, provide a specific example wherever possible, and propose suggested language changes (in red font color), where appropriate.

General Comments

LSPA Comment

Correct spelling of "judgement" to "**judgment**" to make consistent with MCP, Master Q&A, and other guidance documents.

The use of "and/or" throughout a guidance document is confusing because "and/or" is a word that indicates that two words or expressions are to be taken together or individually and is typically not used with more than two options. Consider using "**or**" throughout this document if all items listed in the sentence are not required.

Maintain consistency of italicizing (or, more appropriately, NOT italicizing) Shortforms throughout all chapters of the document.

Provide reasoning why Appendix B material is not updated and provided for reference in the draft guidance

Review anything in quotes to ensure it's an actual cited quote or term that is defined in the document.

It would be useful for MassDEP to provide a list of the target organs in the shortform lookup file that they recommend as being associated with each chemical/toxicity value listed in the shortform. This will help streamline a target organ analysis for risk assessor's using the recommended MassDEP toxicity values.

Please be consistent between using "and" or "&" throughout document. Use of "**and**" is preferred.

Consider using chapter numbers in page numbering of each section, e.g., 11-1.

LSPA Comments on MassDEP Guidance for Disposal Site Risk Characterization | Part 2 - Human Health Risk Assessment

Guidance: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/risk-characterization-guidance-chapters-11-13-public-review-draft/download>

Provided below are the LSP Association's detailed comments on the above stated MassDEP Guidance.

****"Page No."** refers to the pages in the MassDEP Guidance document.

****"Section/Subsection"** refers to the Sections in the MassDEP Guidance document, unless otherwise noted.

The LSPA has made every effort to state the issue of concern, provide a specific example wherever possible, and propose suggested language changes (in red font color), where appropriate.

Chapter 11: Method 3 Risk Characterization

Page No.	Section / Subsection Number	LSPA Comment
2	11.0	Remove 'chronic' because the HI target of 1 applies to chronic, subchronic, and acute exposures. Edit as " the cumulative non-cancer risk shall not exceed a Hazard Index equal to one. "
4	11.1.2	The end of the first paragraph states "If an assessment of potential health effects has not been published by a reputable and authoritative source and a COC is a significant contaminant at the site based on concentration, mass, exposure or risk potential, the hazard identification should include a thorough toxicological assessment for that contaminant prepared by the risk assessor or a toxicologist." If there is not such an assessment available, it is highly likely that there also are no toxicity values available for the chemical. Therefore, this is a larger issue than just the tox profile concept. Suggest revising this sentence as follows: " If an assessment of potential health effects has not been published by a reputable and authoritative source (such as those listed in 310 CMR 40.0993(7)) and a COC is a significant contaminant at the site, consult a risk assessor or a toxicologist to assess what information is available to assess the toxicity of that chemical. "
5	11.2.1	Clarify that exposure for a subchronic duration (up to 10% of average lifespan) is up to 7 years.
7	11.2.3	Clarify that the use of "current toxicity values" should be determined based on the hierarchy of toxicity values provided in 310 CMR 40.0993(7).
8	11.2.3.2	Given the recent memorandum* regarding the elimination of future updates to the IRIS database (and the possibility that other sources of toxicity data may not be updated in a timely fashion), MassDEP should consider including language indicating that updated toxicity information from Other Preferred Sources should be considered where relevant. It could also be helpful to reference the hierarchy of toxicity information sources per the MCP (310 CMR 40.0993(7)). (*April 27, 2026: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Deputy Administrator David Fotouhi issued an internal memorandum titled "Future Development and Use of Risk Assessments"). https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2026-08/future-development-and-use-of-risk-assessments.pdf
11	11.3	Please explain why we are introducing the concept of short term exposures and how they are different from subchronic exposures. These "short term" exposures would be included in a subchronic evaluation defined as exposures less than 7 years. Suggest listing "subchronic" as a major bullet and listing two scenarios as subcategories, which could be shorter-term exposures for OHM with developmental effects and subchronic exposures for any relevant OHM.

11	11.3	The fourth full paragraph on this page states that "all assessments conducted under the MCP must consider subchronic and chronic or lifetime exposures and risks if applicable." Exposure assessment is a site-specific determination and risk assessments should consider the exposures that are relevant to the assessment being conducted. With this context, it is uncertain what this sentence is attempting to convey, since it appears to both require something ("all assessments...must consider") but also say that this is a site-specific decision ("if applicable."). Further, "exposures and risks" is redundant, as exposure is the basis for determining risk. Suggest the following edit: "Assessments conducted under the MCP must consider subchronic, chronic, and lifetime exposures, as applicable."
11	11.3	The document should further address guidance on assessing emergency utility worker acute risks. Recommend incorporating LSPA's flow charts for evaluating risks to short term utility workers, which were provided to Nancy Bettinger of MassDEP in February 2023 and presented by LSPA members in a March 2023 LSPA meeting. The flow charts identify processes for evaluating acute risks in soil, soil gas, and groundwater, and they identify specific OHM and other conditions that necessitate an evaluation of acute risks.
13	11.3.2	The last paragraph on page 13 states "Exposure scenarios (and EPCs) should be developed for current surficial soil activity (0-3 feet), current utility repair (from ground surface to the utility-specific depths for existing utilities), future utility installation and repair (0-6 feet), current and future excavation and construction activities (ground surface to 15 feet or the bottom of contamination), and future uses that are not precluded by an AUL (0-15 feet for future residential use, 0-15 for future commercial use without obligations to maintain barriers or prevent soil relocation, etc.)." Please clarify future excavation and construction activities (ground surface to 15 feet or the bottom of contamination) can be limited by an AUL unlike an emergency utility worker scenario.
17	11.3.3.1	Recommend re-wording the statement "where contamination is increasing, such estimates should not be used to support a conclusion that "no further action" is required." Specifically, when concentrations may be increasing only during specific seasons each year, but the temporal average is not increasing. Furthermore, the magnitude of the risk and the magnitude of the increase must be considered in determining whether an increasing trend is identified. For example, an increasing trend yielding a hazard index of 0.001 is not an indication that a condition of no significant risk cannot be supported. Rather, additional lines of evidence are needed to support a conclusion that a condition of no significant risk will be maintained in the future. In addition, 'no further action' is not an MCP term; recommend changing to 'no significant risk'.
17	11.3.3.1	It is impractical and inconsistent with any other guidance to suggest that EPCs should be calculated on the basis of exposure potential (e.g., chronic vs subchronic) and appears to be mixing the concepts of exposure assumptions and EPCs. EPC calculation is sufficiently conservative in general to account for an upper bound exposure estimate for any exposure period. Suggest this section be reworded to indicate that EPCs should be calculated with a consistent methodology for chronic, subchronic, and lifetime exposures. For acute exposures, a maximum detected concentration may be an appropriate EPC.
19	11.3.3.2.1	The second paragraph appears to be extraneous, as it references averaging concentrations across monitoring wells, which is not relevant for a GW-1 area since each well would be its own exposure point. Suggested deleting the sentence.

19	11.3.3.2.1	Regarding the last paragraph in this section, see comment on 11.3.3.1 regarding calculation of separate EPCs. This statement appears to be in reference to the methodology used in the Shortforms to evaluate subchronic exposure (less than one year of exposure), and in reference to the definition of subchronic exposures, which are several months to 7 years. Suggest clarifying that the content in the paragraph is applicable to evaluations that consider less than one year of exposure.
21	11.3.3.2.3	The last sentence in the first paragraph states that the arithmetic mean of four quarterly samples should be used for comparison. The language in the MCP states specifically that the "EPC" should be at or below the applicable standard. In many cases, a groundwater EPC may incorporate more than four sampling events into the EPC calculation. Therefore, suggest editing this as follows: "The arithmetic mean of a minimum of four quarterly samples..."
22	11.3.3.3	Figure 11.1 overlaps with most of the paragraph below it and the paragraph is unreadable.
22	11.3.3.3	Regarding Figure 11.1 and the text in the second paragraph on this page, the suggestion that exposure points should be defined based on the nature of contamination is antithetical to exposure assessment. In this case, a hot spot evaluation would be most appropriate. If the area does not meet the definition of a Hot Spot (per the MCP), then exposure points should be defined based on exposure potential and not the levels of contamination.
23-24	11.3.3.3.1	The guidance states that "Judgmental sampling data should never be used to calculate the upper confidence limit on the mean because it can result in biased and unreliable results." which directly conflicts with the statement two paragraphs later which says "it is not possible to offer generic guidance for identifying Exposure Points and calculating EPCs for judgemental sampling projects". The first statement is too broad. An upper confidence limit on the mean concentration using judgmental sampling can be conservative and appropriate.
26	11.3.3.3.3	This comment addresses the statement that "If ProUCL is employed, MassDEP strongly recommends using Version 5.1 and not Version 5.2." We understand that MassDEP disagrees with the recommended UCLs as identified in the UCL hierarchy in ProUCL version 5.2 (and presumably this is the reason for the statement in the draft guidance that 5.1 is recommended). This disagreement, however, does not extend to how UCLs are actually calculated in ProUCL version 5.2 as compared to ProUCL version 5.1. The differences in the calculated UCLs between the two versions are minimal. For example, a 90th percentile nonparametric Chebyshev UCL would be the same value whether generated in ProUCL version 5.1 or 5.2. With an eye to making this guidance more "evergreen," we suggest that this text be revised to be more generic, for example: "If ProUCL is employed, MassDEP recommends using version 5.1, including for recommendations on an appropriate UCL. If version 5.2 (or later) is used, a UCL may be selected from the UCLs generated by the program and used as an EPC if justification is provided."
31	11.3.3.6	Please provide MassDEPs expanded definition for defining "coal tar waste deposits" as provided in a Q&A in this guidance document.
31-33	11.3.3.6	Suggest consistent use of the term "visible coal tar waste deposits." For example, the last paragraph in Section 11.3.3.6 refers only to "coal tar"
34	11.3.3.7	4th paragraph states MassDEP recommends against reducing fish consumption exposure factors when assessing small streams to ensure evaluation of full and unrestricted use of the resource. However, many small streams, particularly ephemeral streams, cannot support a viable fish population and/or typically-caught/consumed species throughout the year. Thus, we recommend that, for ephemeral streams and other small waterbodies, professional judgment be used to tailor fish consumption rates as needed.

35	11.3.3	Fix header numbering. Quantitative Estimation of Exposure should be 11.3.4
35	11.3.3	Suggest adding discussion of ambient air EPCs
50	11.3.4.3	Dermal absorption-chemicals outside effective predictive domain (EPD). Text indicates for such chemicals, to use the oral dose with a dermal multiplier. However, US EPA dermal guidance (RAGS-E) section 6.3 indicates for such chemicals that "Although the methodology can be used to predict dermal exposures and risk to contaminants in water outside the EPD, there appears to be greater uncertainty for these contaminants. OSWER and the workgroup, which developed this guidance, do not recommend that the model be used to quantify exposure and risk to contaminants in water that are outside the EPD in the "body" of the risk assessment. Rather, it is recommended that such information be presented in the discussion of uncertainty in the risk assessment.". We recommend that MassDEP guidance mirror EPA's recommendations and not include quantification of dermal risk for organic constituents outside of the EPD, but instead address qualitatively in the uncertainty analysis.
62	11.4.2	The proposed method for calculation of target organ hazard indices is impractical and inconsistent with other (e.g., USEPA RAGS) guidance. There are exceptionally few chemicals for which there is sufficient information to assess what "other" effects may be relevant at doses that are higher than the RfD. For the majority of chemicals, this information is not accessible or available. While some toxicological reports (e.g., IRIS) do identify multiple candidate RfDs based on different effects, this is an extremely small proportion of chemicals with toxicity information, and utilizing such a method will not provide any meaningful increase in protectiveness. Critical effects and their associated RfDs are derived to be protective of people including sensitive subpopulations, and are identified based on what is considered to be the most relevant toxicological endpoint. In addition, where a chemical has been determined to affect multiple organ systems (e.g., arsenic), the HQ contribution for arsenic is considered for each of those target organs. Given these considerations, recommend that this section be revised to use a target organ HI approach that is consistent with USEPA.
65	11.6	Re-shortcuts: "For example, the risk assessor might assign the toxicity value for the most toxic contaminants at a site to all contaminants at the site." While we appreciate shortcuts, this particular example is not technically justified and is inappropriate to be provided as an example in a guidance document. Using high-use exposure scenarios and maximum concentrations as EPCs are appropriate examples to use for a screening-level assessment. Substituting toxicity values (using the most conservative for all OHM) is inappropriate; it undermines the risk assessment process that provides meaningful estimates of risk to guide decision making and communicate risk.

LSPA Comments on MassDEP Guidance for Disposal Site Risk Characterization | Part 2 - Human Health Risk Assessment

Guidance: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/risk-characterization-guidance-chapters-11-13-public-review-draft/download>

Provided below are the LSP Association's detailed comments on the above stated MassDEP Guidance.

****"Page No."** refers to the pages in the MassDEP Guidance document.

****"Section/Subsection"** refers to the Sections in the MassDEP Guidance document, unless otherwise noted.

The LSPA has made every effort to state the issue of concern, provide a specific example wherever possible, and propose suggested language changes (in red font color), where appropriate.

Chapter 12: Imminent Hazard Evaluations

Page No.	Section / Subsection Number	LSPA Comment
4	Table 12-1	Footnote: Recommend changing the date from February 2026 to the actual promulgation date of the MCP (April 12, 2024) because MCP citations do not change until the next promulgated version of the MCP. The MCP was not updated in February 2026.
6	12.1.2	Last Sentence in First Partial Paragraph: Consider defining what is meant by "multiples" and rephrase sentence for clarity. Delete "rule-of-thumb": it is extraneous.
6	12.1.2	Last Full Sentence: Consider rephrasing for clarity or breaking into two separate sentences. Confusing.
7	12.1.2	Top of page, first full paragraph: Change "Shortforms itself" to "Shortforms themselves" or "Shortform itself".
9	12.2.5	Delete the word "Finally,". This is a new subsection that is also not the final subsection.
9	12.2.5	"Contaminants of Concern" are not previously discussed or defined in this chapter. Recommend changing to "OHM" .
9	12.2.6	Third Paragraph: The summary in this paragraph does not provide a full description of the options for deriving EPCs. Recommend simply stating that EPCs should be derived consistently with MCP regulations and guidance.
9	12.2.6	Please review for consistency of the use of the terms "Imminent Hazard Evaluations" and "IH evaluations". Choose one and use throughout.
9	12.2.6	Recommend defining 'exposure factor approach' using this edit: "MCP risk characterizations and IH evaluations typically calculate intakes and exposures ("exposure factor approach"), whereby...."
10	12.2.6	Replace "IEUBK" with "biokinetic models" since these models can change and presently there are three models to choose from for lead.
11	12.2.8.2	Remove quotation marks from around "Serious effects" and make consistent with 310 CMR 40.0955(2)(c)1: "a Hazard Index (or equivalent ratio of exposure) equal to one for oil or hazardous materials that have the potential to cause serious effects (including, but not limited to, lethal, developmental, or neurological effects) following short-term exposures, for example lead or cyanide;"
11	12.2.8.2	Last Sentence: As noted above, "Contaminants of Concern" should be changed to "OHM" .

12	12.2.8.3	Please change the title of this subsection (Readily Apparent Harm) to Readily Apparent Health Effects , consistent with the section's contents. The RAH term relates, per the MCP, solely to evaluation of ecological risk.
12	12.4	IHE for Public Welfare: Suggest deleting this section. 310 CMR 40.0955 specifically states that IHE is for human health, environment, and safety, and does not include public welfare. The MCP does not specify what criteria need to be evaluated and met for concluding whether or not an Imminent Hazard to public welfare exists. The proposed example in this draft guidance highlights odor/taste as a potential IH. However, these types of nuisance conditions are already evaluated as part of the Method 3 RC to Public Welfare evaluation. This draft guidance language suggests taste or odor problems, even without IH conditions related to human health, could pose an Imminent Hazard. This is problematic in that it suggests to the reader that there is little to no distinction between IH and Significant Risk for public welfare where these conditions exist.

LSPA Comments on MassDEP Guidance for Disposal Site Risk Characterization | Part 2 - Human Health Risk Assessment

Guidance: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/risk-characterization-guidance-chapters-11-13-public-review-draft/download>

Provided below are the LSP Association's detailed comments on the above stated MassDEP Guidance.

***"Page No." refers to the pages in the MassDEP Guidance document.*

***"Section/Subsection" refers to the Sections in the MassDEP Guidance document, unless otherwise noted.*

The LSPA has made every effort to state the issue of concern, provide a specific example wherever possible, and propose suggested language changes (in red font color), where appropriate.

Chapter 13: Risk of Harm to Safety and Public Welfare

Page No.	Section / Subsection Number	LSPA Comment
General	N/A	Section 5.1.4 of the Draft Characterization of Petroleum Contaminated Sites document, dated June 22, 2026 states: "Definitive and quantitative guidelines and standards on when a petroleum odor constitutes a nuisance condition and significant risk to public welfare are difficult to articulate. In the context of petroleum-contaminated sites, however, the following Rules of Thumb are suggested for when an odor condition would generally NOT be considered a nuisance condition: -Odors observed in the subsurface during excavation or boring advancement would generally not be considered a nuisance condition, as long as such odors are not consistently or intermittently detectable in ambient or indoor air, and as long as excavation or disturbance of such soils is unlikely, based upon site-specific conditions and/or the institution of an Activity and Use Limitation. -Odors observed in the breathing zone of the ambient air would generally not be considered a nuisance condition if they are discernable less than 10 days a year. -Odors observed in the ambient air or indoor air of an impacted structure would generally not be considered a nuisance condition if the occupants of such a structure do not believe such odors significantly affect or degrade their quality of life." This language (or the language from the final petroleum guidance document) should be included in the Section 13 of the Risk Characterization guidance document, including a discussion of the application of these Rules of Thumb to OHM that are not petroleum related.
1	13.1	The draft guidance states that: "Safety risks that are not related to a release or threat of release of OHM should still be addressed immediately with notification of the proper authorities but would not be considered a Response Action taken under the MCP". Recommend removing this statement as the guidance document pertains to assessment conducted under the MCP and not assessments involving notification to "proper authorities".
4	13.2.1	The first paragraph on this page appears to make the point that a Method 1 or Method 2 Standard would not be set higher than a Method 3 Ceiling Limit (M3CL) and thus Method 1/2 Standards are protective of public welfare risk relative to M3CLs. This is a valid and accurate point. However, the paragraph proceeds to discuss levels of exposure and suggests a provision for "site-specific" M3CLs in a Method 3 Risk Characterization. Suggest either deleting this entire paragraph or deleting everything after the first sentence.
5	13.2.2.2	Suggest eliminating "gross contamination" in the first sentence as it is not defined within the MCP and does not add to the sentence.

5	13.2.2.2	The consideration of Method 3 Ceiling Limits notes that "There is a real risk that one (or more) of these systems will fail at a site over time, whether through natural occurrences, new toxicological information, or human negligence". Suggest that the statement be removed as there are numerous concerns. First, the term "real risk" should not be used this way in a guidance on risk assessment. Second, a change to a toxicological parameter does not represent a failure to a system. Third, risk assessment relies on standard assumptions and legal documentation (AULs) and cannot instead rely on an assumption of future human negligence.
5	13.2.2.2	In the last paragraph on this page (and elsewhere), the text refers to "extremely elevated" levels of OHM. This is non-specific and subject to interpretation. Suggest instead stating "levels of OHM above applicable M3CLs", since that is the criterion that is implied by this term.
5	13.2.2.2	First Paragraph (and throughout guidance document): After providing the abbreviation for Method 3 Ceiling Limits (M3CLs), use the abbreviation throughout the remaining portions of the document. This abbreviation inconsistency occurs throughout the document for multiple different abbreviations (e.g., OHM, COCs, etc.)
5	13.2.2.2	First Sentence of Last Paragraph: Please add "Responsible Party (RP)" and "Other Person" to "Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) to be consistent with the MCP: "RP, PRP or Other Person".
6	13.2.2.2	Comparison of Site Concentrations to Method 3 Ceiling Limits (M3CLs) section. Revise the last sentence that currently reads, "This comparison is different from the human health risk characterization and does not allow for a "no exposure means no risk" conclusion", to "The comparison is different from the human health risk characterization." This eliminates the discussion of the term "no exposure means no risk", which is not defined in the MCP.
6	13.2.2.2	Change the last sentence in the Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) section that reads, "The more refined comparison using the Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbon fractions would determine if there is a condition of No Significant Risk (or not)", to state: "The more refined comparison using the Aliphatic and Aromatic Hydrocarbon fractions would determine if average concentrations of these constituents exceed the M3CLs."
6	13.2.2.2	Under Physical Controls Allowing for a Condition of No Significant Risk, suggest changing the second sentence that reads, "The implementation of one or more of such controls would allow for a finding that a condition of No Significant Risk exists for the site", to "The implementation of one or more of such controls would allow, in the areas of the controls, for a finding that a condition of no significant risk of harm to public welfare exists."
6	13.2.2.2	General comment for the Physical Controls section - the guidance document uses "No Significant Risk" in this section. Suggest that the language be changed to specify "no significant risk to public welfare" to distinguish the type of risk being evaluated and to be consistent with the discussion of "no significant risk to safety" elsewhere in the chapter.
7	13.2.2.2	In the last bullet of "Deriving M3CLs for OHM Not Listed in 310 CMR 40.0996(7)", suggest eliminating or revising the first sentence as S-1 and S-2 Standards are not required to be calculated as stated in the second sentence of the bullet. For the sentence in the same bullet that starts with "having determined..." add "following the equations and parameters described in 310 CMR 40.0984."
7	13.2.2.2	Suggest citing the MCP and not listing the default M3CLs for soil and groundwater, as they may change over time.

8	13.2.2.2	Suggest including language referencing that radiation-related risks posed by Radioactive Materials are exempt from M3CL comparisons (and there are regulations in addition to the MCP that provide controls).
8	13.2.2.2	Subsection titled: Ongoing Monitoring of OHM Exceeding M3CLs: The 2024 MCP change in Upper Concentration Limits to M3CLs eliminated the evaluation of non-aqueous phase liquid (NAPL) thickness. Suggest including language that the thickness of NAPL is no longer compared to a M3CL as part of assessing risk of harm to public welfare.
8	13.2.2.3	Recommend deleting Spiderman clip art considering it is likely trademarked and seems out of place with the rest of the document.
10	13.2.2.2	Suggest including depth (3') on Figure 13-2 similar to the depths shown in Figure 13-3.
10	13.2.2.3	First Paragraph, Fourth Sentence repeats the sentence that appears in the last paragraph in Section 13.2.2.2 on Page 5. Again, suggest that the statement be removed as there are numerous concerns. See previous comment on this statement.
10	13.2.2.3	If visible coal tar waste deposits (VCTWD) are present at a Site, the guidance discusses only two ways of achieving a condition of No Significant Risk to public welfare under future Site conditions, i.e., the deposit is 15 or more feet underground or the material is under an Engineered Barrier and an AUL is implemented. It is recognized that this is consistent with the language in the 2024 MCP. However, the supporting 2024 MCP Amendments Q&A states that: "MassDEP has considered alternative means to remediate coal tar waste deposits if the alternative effectively reduces or eliminates the potential risks posed by the coal tar wastes by permanently transforming the nature of the material to the point where it no longer has the characteristics of the visible coal tar waste deposit. Persons contemplating the use of such alternatives should contact the BWSC Deputy Regional Director for the region where the project site is located to discuss the proposal before proceeding. The treatment alternative must be adequately justified, e.g. documentation of bench scale and QA/QC testing as appropriate in the Phase III RAP, Phase IV RIP and Phase IV FIR." Language discussing the possibility of achieving a condition of no significant risk to public welfare via remediation of VCTWD should be added. This would be consistent with the guidance's stated approach in Section 13.2.2.3 of modeling the VCTWD requirements after those for the Method 3 Ceiling Limits, which specifically allow for the permanent immobilization or fixation of the OHM to achieve a condition of no significant risk.
11	13.2.3	First Sentence: Please change "reasonable" to " reasonably " to be consistent with the MCP: "reasonably foreseeable future" [40.0942(1)(e), 40.0994(4), and 40.1005].
11	13.2.3	Third bullet under #1: Suggest changing statement to " ...are also protective of livestock exposures, if livestock exposure is reasonably foreseeable. "