

Message

From: Abboud, Michael [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=B6F5AF791A1842F1ADCC088CBF9ED3CE-ABBOUD, MIC]
Sent: 12/5/2017 2:44:01 PM
To: Annie Nova; [REDACTED] **Ex. 6**; Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]; Sarah Kerr
Subject: [REDACTED] **Ex. 6**
RE: Reducing costs and burdens for remediating parties

Hey Annie, you can attribute the quote below an EPA spokesperson.

“EPA wants to work with all PRPs to ensure cleanup of NPL sites is done in an efficient and effective manner. EPA recognizes the costs associated with oversight is seen as an added burden to PRPs, who view it as “double payment” for their work. EPA is looking at various options to reduce costs, including discounting bills to PRPs who are cooperative with EPA and will utilize the discounted funds for the implementation of betterments of the site.”-EPA spokesperson

From: Annie Nova [REDACTED] **Ex. 6**
Sent: Sunday, December 3, 2017 3:02 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Sarah Kerr <[REDACTED] **Ex. 6**>
Subject: Reducing costs and burdens for remediating parties

Hello,

Working on a story for WNYC on the Gowanus Superfund in Brooklyn. One of Scott Pruitt's stated Superfund goals is to "Reduce the administrative and overhead costs and burdens borne by parties remediating contaminated sites, including a reexamination of the level of agency oversight necessary."

1. *How* will Pruitt reduce costs and burdens for parties remediating?
2. How will this affect the Gowanus, for example, where there are dozens of parties tasked with remediating?

Many thanks,
Annie Nova