



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IX

75 Hawthorne Street

San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

October 31, 1995

Mr. Stephen Chao
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Engineering Field Activity, West
900 Commodore Way, Bldg. 101
San Bruno, CA. 94066-2402

Re: Submittal of *Draft Final Station-Wide Remedial Investigation Report (RI)*,
Moffett Federal Airfield

Dear Mr. Chao,

The purpose of this letter is to reiterate what the regulatory agencies (U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control and Regional Water Quality Control Board) collectively require as part of the cumulative risk assessment in the subject document. A meeting was held on July 28, 1995 between the Navy and the agencies regarding the RI and associated agencies' comments on the draft RI. Many questions centered around the cumulative risk assessment. The agencies left the meeting with the understanding that the issues had been resolved and that the Navy would submit a draft final version of the RI on September 20, 1995, 60 days after the last set of comments were submitted. At present, we have not received the draft final document. At the RPM meeting of October 11, 1995 (21 days after the draft final RI was due to the agencies), you again raised issues of concern about the cumulative risk assessment. Many conversations and conference calls have since occurred. To clarify as many of these issues as possible, we hereby provide the following list of requirements that are necessary to include in the draft final RI's cumulative risk assessment.

1. Provide a visual representation of the site risks before remediation. This should include 4 maps, including 2 point risk maps (industrial and residential scenarios) and 2 area risk maps, if you wish (industrial and residential scenarios). The point risk maps may be included either in the text or in an appendix; however, the document should not contain language which editorializes on the value of the point risk approach.
2. Provide a visual representation of the site risks after remediation. This should also include 4 maps, including 2 point risk maps (industrial and residential scenarios) and 2 area risk maps, if you wish (industrial and residential scenarios). The point risk maps may be included either in the text or in an appendix; however, the document should not contain language which editorializes on the value of the point risk approach.
3. Perform a spatial analysis of the inorganics (chemicals of concern) arsenic, antimony, chromium and any others that show risks greater than 10^{-6} . Provide a map of these inorganic concentrations and conclude whether or not they are "ambient" background levels (either naturally occurring or anthropogenic in origin). Provide the inorganic risk values in the text and provide rationale in the text to support the elimination of any inorganics from the point or area risk maps.

4. The assumptions that should be made when creating the point risk and area risk maps follow. These requirements consider data availability (sampling density), airfield size, and other factors and should be considered site specific requirements. These assumptions may or may not apply to other Navy sites.
 - a. Use the same database of contaminant concentrations for both point risk and area risk maps. Specifically, ensure that you consistently include or exclude inorganics data (per b. below) and lab contaminant data (per g. below) in each map.
 - b. Do not include any inorganics data in either point risk or area risk if, through the spatial analysis, you can document that risks from these chemicals are associated with ambient background levels (either naturally occurring or anthropogenic).
 - c. Use soil contaminant concentration data from 0-2 feet in depth for the industrial scenario of the area risk.
 - d. Also use soil contaminant concentration data from 0-2 feet in depth for the residential scenario of the area risk, provided there are no data which indicate the presence of higher soil contaminant concentrations at depths of 2-10 feet. Otherwise, use the highest concentration that exists from 0-10 feet.
 - e. Use area size of 1/2 acre for the industrial scenario of the area risk calculation.
 - f. Use an area size that is representative of a typical lot size for Santa Clara County for the residential scenario of the area risk calculation; provide documentation to support your choice.
 - g. Lab contaminant data should not be included in the point risk or area risk maps unless these specific chemicals are associated with possible releases. Provide explanation for the choices made.
 - h. Assume non-detect data equals zero risk for the point and area risk maps. High detection limits as a result of matrix interference (e.g. PAHs in the ecological areas) should be brought to the agencies' attention in the document.

Pursuant to § 26 of the NAS Moffett Field Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), the regulatory agencies are considering the possibility of assessing stipulated penalties for the late submittal of the *Draft Final Station-Wide Remedial Investigation Report*. As mentioned above, this primary document under the FFA was due September 20, 1995. This date was determined by adding 60 days to the date of the last set of regulatory comments sent to the Navy on the draft version. EPA comments were sent to the Navy in a letter dated July 12, 1995 and State comments were sent on July 22, 1995. Pursuant to § 26.1 of the FFA, EPA could assess a stipulated penalty of \$5,000 for the first week's failure to submit the report (covering the period from September 20, 1995 through September 27, 1995) and an additional \$10,000 for each subsequent week (or part thereof) that the report remains overdue.

Today we received your extension request letter, outlining the reasons for delayed submittal of the draft final RI. Pursuant to § 27.4 of the FFA, our response to that request is due within 7

days (November 7, 1995). Your written agreement with the above terms, prior to November 7, 1995, would influence us in favor of your extension request. A written agreement would document our collective understanding of the required contents of the RI, reducing the possibility of a future dispute on the risk assessment itself. In any event, in consultation with the State, we will respond to your extension request by November 7, 1995.

Under the existing schedule, including extensions previously approved by the Department of Defense and the regulatory agencies, the Navy has a commitment to deliver the *Draft Final Station-Wide Feasibility Study* by March 1, 1996 under § 334 of the 1992 Defense Authorization Act, formerly the Panetta Bill. We believe that the Navy should make every effort to meet this deadline. If the risk assessment issues in this RI cannot be resolved in a timely fashion, we find it hard to believe that the FS will be delivered on time. In the future, we request that any extension request correspondence be sent to the agencies prior to the due date of the document in question. If you have any questions, please call me (415-744-2385), Mike Bessette (RWQCB) (510-286-1028) or Joseph Chou (DTSC) (510-540-3830).

Sincerely,



Michael D. Gill
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Cleanup Office

cc: C. Joseph Chou (DTSC)
Michael Bessette (RWQCB)
Ken Eichstaedt (URS)
Sandy Olliges (NASA)
Peter Strauss (MHB)
Mike Young (PRC) (Fax)