

N62578.AR.003025
NCBC DAVISVILLE
5090.3a

EMAIL AND U S EPA COMMENTS ON DRAFT GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT CED
AREA NCBC DAVISVILLE RI
8/19/2013
NAVFAC MIDLANT

DV3

Taybron-Currie, Sharon

From: Sinagoga, Lee Ann
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Taybron-Currie, Sharon
Cc: Anderson, Scott
Subject: FW: responses to your comments re: CED Area Geophysical Survey
Attachments: Davisville CED Area Geophysical Survey Response to EPA-RIDEM Comments_08.19.13.docx

Hi Sharon,

This E-mail and attachment needs to be added to Scott's WE01 files and to the NIRIS system.

Thanks much for your time and support,

Lee Ann

Lee Ann Sinagoga | Department Manager/Chemistry & Risk Assessment
Direct: 412.921.8887 | Main: 412.921.7090 | Fax: 412.921.4040 leeann.sinagoga@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Chemistry & Risk Assessment
661 Andersen Drive | Pittsburgh, PA 15220 | www.tetrattech.com

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dale, Jeffrey M CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, EV [<mailto:jeffrey.m.dale@navy.mil>]
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2013 11:36 AM
To: williams.christine@epa.gov; Richard Gottlieb
Cc: Barney, David A CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO NE; Anderson, Scott; Sinagoga, Lee Ann; glucksman@mabbett.com; Brandon.Bill@epa.gov; Shoemaker, Robert; jforan1@maine.rr.com; Brandon.Bill@epa.gov
Subject: responses to your comments re: CED Area Geophysical Survey

Christine and Richard

You should have received the Draft Geophysical Survey Report of the CED Area where the drums were recently located. Scott sent an ftp link last week and is mailing hardcopies. You provided very timely comments on the work plan. Your comments were received in time that the field procedures were adapted to incorporate your suggestions; or responses are contained within the report.

Attached are informal responses to your comments received via email.
Please forward to any team member that I omitted.

Thanks

Jeff

Christine's email of 6/11/13

EPA comment #1.

What is the makeup of the boulder? Will that interfere with the geophysical techniques? What was/is in the drums? Will that interfere with the geophysical techniques?

Navy response #1:

The boulder is identified as a mid- to high-grade metamorphic rock that did not appear to exhibit strong magnetism that would be expected to cause potentially high anomalous responses. See draft report section 5. The drum contents will be characterized during excavation. Drum contents are not known (pending characterization). However, it is unlikely that the drum contents would interfere with the geophysical techniques to the extent that drum contents would off-set response to a false-negative condition.

EPA comment #2

EPA agrees with RIDEM that if additional disposal is suspected outside the planned survey area it should be investigated.

Navy response #2:

No anomalies that were interpreted to be drums were identified at the edge of the study area. See sections 5 and 6 of the draft report.

Richard's email of 6/11/13

RIDEM comments:

I have reviewed the work plan for the geophysical survey of the NCBC CED Area. The methodology used should be able to detect a single drum to a depth of 12' or roughly 4 meters. This is the general reach of a backhoe. If anomalies are detected beyond the 200' x 300' area shown on the map they should also be investigated.

Navy response:

Sections 2 and 4 of the report state the approximate affective depth of the ground penetrating radar was ten feet, consistent with the general reach of a backhoe. Anomalies interpreted to be buried drums were identified in the vicinity of the boulder/existing excavation. No anomalies (interpreted to be drums) were identified at the edge of the study area.

el : 1: 1 :1 c o (4 o (4 o

Christine's email of 8/13/13

My contractor did look at the work plan. Except for a note that your geophysical techniques may not reach under the boulder, I didn't have anything else to send you at that time knowing the time constraints. I planned on asking the question once you sent the work plan, (so I'd know if you planned on using the GPR) before asking your contractor. I still think your should test the suspected drum.

Initial plans were to move the boulder after the geophysical survey, and prior to excavation of nearby drums. The remedial contractor indicated that very large equipment would be necessary to move the boulder. The disposition of the boulder can be discussed upon distribution of the removal action work plan.

The drum contents will be characterized during excavation.