

PROPOSED PLAN

SITE 3 – LANDFILL NO. 1

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY – CHESAPEAKE BAY DETACHMENT
CHESAPEAKE BEACH, MARYLANDFINAL
MAY 2026**1 Introduction**

The purpose of this **Proposed Plan** is to identify the preferred alternative and to facilitate community involvement in the selection of the Final Remedy. This Proposed Plan addresses soil and **groundwater** at Site 3 – Landfill No. 1, which is located at the Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment (NRL-CBD) in Chesapeake Beach, Maryland (**Figure 1**). The preferred alternative is **No Action** for soil and groundwater at Site 3. This Proposed Plan satisfies the public participation requirements under Section 117(a) of the **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)** and the **National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP)** Section 300.430(f)(3). This Proposed Plan provides the rationale for the No Action recommendation based on the investigative activities performed at Site 3 to date and explains how the public can participate in the decision-making process.

The Department of the Navy (Navy), in consultation with the **Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)**, will make a final decision on the No Action for soil and groundwater at Site 3

after reviewing and considering all information submitted during the 30-day **public comment period**. The Navy may select another **response action** other than No Action based on public comments and/or new information. Community involvement is critical, and the public is encouraged to review and comment on this Proposed Plan. Information on how to participate in this decision-making process is presented in **Section 8**, Community Participation.

After the public comment period has ended, and the information submitted has been reviewed and considered, the Navy, in consultation with MDE, will document the No Action alternative for soil and groundwater at Site 3 in a **Decision Document (DD)**. The DD will explain the No Action selection process based on the information and technical analysis generated during the **Remedial Investigation (RI)** and will consider public comments and community concerns. Any comments or questions received during the comment period will be documented in the **Responsiveness Summary** section of the DD.

Community Involvement Opportunities 30-Day Public Comment Period: May 15–June 15, 2026**Submit Your Comments***May 15–June 15, 2026*

The Navy will accept public comments on this Proposed Plan during the 30-day public comment period. Comments must be postmarked or sent via phone or email no later than June 15, 2026. For contact information, please refer to the text box on **page 8**.

Attend the Public Meeting

Based on public interest, the public comment period may include a public meeting during which the Navy and MDE will provide an overview of the site, investigation findings, answer questions, and receive public comments. If you think a public meeting is needed, please contact the Naval District Washington representative listed on **page 8**.

Information Repository Location

This Proposed Plan is based on site-related documents contained in the **Administrative Record**, which can provide you with important background and site investigation information about Site 3.

It can be found online at the following location: <https://go.usa.gov/xSeKn>.

A copy can also be found at **Calvert Library – Twin Beaches Branch** 4100 5th Street, North Beach, MD 20714 (410) 257-2411

2 Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment Location and History

NRL-CBD is located south of Chesapeake Beach, Maryland, and approximately 40 miles southeast of Washington, D.C. NRL-CBD occupies approximately 160 acres along the western shoreline of the Chesapeake Bay (**Figure 1**). The facility is separated into eastern and western portions by Bayside Road (Maryland State Route 261) and is bounded by the Chesapeake Bay to the east and offsite residential housing areas to the north, south, and west.

The original acquisition of land for NRL-CBD was made in 1941, and construction progressed rapidly during World War II. Major expansion occurred in 1953 and 1954 with construction of a large laboratory building, shop facilities, and complete utility systems (NEESA 1984).

The mission of NRL-CBD is to provide and maintain facilities for use by the research divisions of the Naval Research Laboratory – Washington, D.C., for the testing, development, and evaluation of radar, radio, optical, and fire control equipment, along with other research projects requiring a maritime environment or open skies but with land-based support facilities (NEESA 1984).

3 Site 3 – Landfill No. 1

Site 3 – Landfill No. 1, also known as “Old Junk Row,” is located on the western portion of NRL-CBD, south and adjacent to the main access road (**Figure 1**). According to the Initial Assessment Study (IAS), the site consisted of four to six 25-foot by 25-foot by 20-foot-deep excavation pits occupying 3,750 square feet (NEESA 1984). After landfilling operations ceased, the site was used as open storage and while best management practices were followed during the sites use as an open storage area, the potential for undocumented spills remained. Based on site usage as a storage area, the current site boundary occupies an area of 81,411 square feet. The site is relatively flat, with an approximate elevation of 125 feet above mean sea level. The area occupying the site is currently used as maintained office space consisting of three research buildings and a parking lot.

Landfill No. 1 was operational from 1942 through 1950. As previously mentioned, the landfill consisted of four to six pits and reportedly accepted three types of debris: municipal debris, such as household garbage and tree trimming refuse; shop debris such as wooden boxes, cardboard cartons, oily rags, absorbent materials, empty oil cans, lubricant cans, and paint sludges; and nontoxic laboratory debris, such as paper towels, cardboard boxes, and small quantities of debris solvents (NEESA 1984). Once the landfill was filled with refuse to within 4 feet of ground surface, the remaining space was backfilled with excavated soil to ground surface (NEESA 1984). After the landfill was closed, the area on top of the landfill was designated “Old Junk Row” and used as open storage for disabled heavy equipment, demolition debris, and out-of-service laboratory equipment used in radar, sonar, and optics research (NEESA 1984). During the IAS survey conducted in 1983, crusted and stained soils were observed in the area. In the late 1980s, research buildings were constructed at the site in association with development of the Fire Testing Area.

This section summarizes previous environmental investigations associated with Site 3.

3.1 2012 Site Inspection

The **Site Inspection (SI)** was conducted in 2010 to identify, assess, and confirm and characterize the extent of soil and groundwater **contamination** at Site 3. The SI included performing a digital geophysical mapping (DGM) survey across 17 transects, the excavation of two test pits, surface and/or **subsurface soil** sampling at five boring locations, and the installation of temporary monitoring wells at four locations. The DGM identified two areas of interest where former waste disposal pits may have been located. Test pits were excavated in the two areas of interest, and no waste material or debris was encountered. Soil samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), pesticides and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and metals. **Surface soil** samples were also analyzed for pH and total organic carbon. No groundwater samples were collected due to the low permeability of the material in which the

Figure 1 – Site 3 – Landfill No. 1 Site Location



temporary wells were installed. SI results indicated that further investigation was warranted for Site 3 due to the presence of contaminants in soil and the lack of groundwater data.

3.2 2018 Expanded Site Inspection

The Expanded Site Inspection (ESI) was conducted in 2018 to conduct additional investigation of potential disposal areas, further delineation of contaminants identified in soil during the SI, and to evaluate site groundwater. The ESI included the excavation of three test pits, surface and/or subsurface soil sampling at 10 soil boring locations, the installation of one permanent monitoring well, and the collection of three groundwater samples. Test pits were excavated in additional areas of interest where waste disposal may have occurred, and no waste material or debris was encountered. Soil samples were analyzed for SVOCs, pesticides and PCBs, and metals. Groundwater samples were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides and PCBs, and metals. Based on human health and ecological risk screenings performed using the SI and ESI analytical results, one PCB (Aroclor-1260) and one metal (arsenic) were identified as **constituents of potential concern (COPCs)** in surface soil at Site 3, and the ESI recommended further investigation of these COPCs.

3.3 Remedial Investigation

The objective of the RI was to document the site background and description, previous investigations activities, and collect sufficient data to characterize and evaluate the nature and extent of contamination in surface and shallow subsurface soil to quantify the potential risks posed to human health and the environment as a result of exposure to these **media**. During the RI, surface and shallow subsurface soil samples were collected from five boring locations and analyzed for Aroclor-1260 and arsenic.

Based on the results of the test pitting activities conducted during the SI and ESI, no debris was encountered in any of the test pits, and no other indications of debris placement, such as soil staining, were noted. SVOCs, PCBs, pesticides, and

metals were detected in surface and subsurface soils at Site 3 collected during the SI, ESI, or RI. In addition, one VOC, SVOCs, and metals were detected in groundwater at Site 3 during the ESI. Surface and subsurface soil concentrations of Aroclor-1260 throughout Site 3 exceed applicable screening criteria with an isolated elevated concentration detected in the subsurface soil sample collected near the eastern site boundary. Arsenic concentrations in soil samples were delineated to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Residential Soil Regional Screening Level and/or the **background concentrations** that were calculated and are presented in the Soil Background Study Report for Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment (Tetra Tech 2015). A **human health risk assessment (HHRA)** and an **ecological risk assessment (ERA)** were conducted as part of the RI Report to evaluate potential **human health risks** and **ecological risks** associated with soil and groundwater at Site 3. The **risk assessments** used data collected during the SI, ESI, and RI phases. COPCs were evaluated in the HHRA for exposure to surface/subsurface soil and groundwater, and COPCs were evaluated in the ERA for surface soil. No COPCs were identified as **constituents of concern (COCs)** for soil or groundwater at Site 3, and No Action is recommended.

4 Principal Threat Wastes

“Principal threat wastes,” defined by the NCP in Title 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* Section 300.430(a)(1)(iii)(A), are source materials that are considered to be highly toxic or highly mobile and that generally cannot be reliably contained or would present a significant risk to human health or the environment should they be exposed. There are no principal threat wastes present in the soil or groundwater at Site 3.

5 Scope and Role of the Action

This preferred alternative presented within this Proposed Plan is No Action for soil and groundwater at Site 3. The purpose of this Proposed Plan is to summarize investigative activities performed to date and to provide a rationale for No Action for soil and groundwater at Site 3.

6 Summary of Site Risks

This section presents an overview of how the risks to people, plants, and animals, associated with exposure to soil and groundwater at Site 3 under current and anticipated future land uses, were evaluated.

HHRAs and ERAs were conducted to evaluate site receptor exposure to soil and/or groundwater at Site 3 as part of the Final RI Report and are summarized in the following. Please refer to the Final RI Report for detailed information regarding the baseline risk assessments (available in the Administrative Record Information Repository).

6.1 Human Health Risks for Exposure to Soil and Groundwater

Chemicals detected in the soil were evaluated in an HHRA following the process outlined in the text box titled “What is Human Health Risk and How is it Calculated?” Carcinogenic (cancer) risks and noncarcinogenic (non-cancer) hazards from exposure to soil and groundwater were evaluated for the following classifications of people (receptors) who may potentially contact these media:

- Construction Worker (soil and groundwater)
- Industrial Worker (soil)
- Adult and Adolescent Visitor/Trespasser (soil)
- Future Resident (adults and children who might live at the site; assuming the site is redeveloped for residential use) (soil and groundwater)

What is Human Health Risk and How Is It Calculated?

An HHRA estimates “baseline risk” posed to receptors exposed to site-related contamination. An HHRA is an estimate of the likelihood of health problems occurring if no cleanup action were taken at a site. The Navy undertakes a four-step process to estimate baseline risk at a site:

Step 1: Identify Site-Related Contamination

In Step 1, the Navy looks at the concentrations of chemicals found at a site as well as past scientific studies on the effects these chemicals have had on people (or animals, when human studies are unavailable). Comparisons between site-specific concentrations and concentrations established by EPA as generic screening levels that are protective of residential exposure help the Navy to determine which chemicals detected at the site are most likely to pose a potential impact to human health. These chemicals are identified as COPCs and are evaluated in the next steps of the HHRA.

Step 2: Estimate Exposure

In Step 2, the Navy considers the different ways that people might be exposed to the COPCs identified in Step 1, the concentrations that people might be exposed to, and the potential frequency and duration of exposure. Using this information, a “**reasonable maximum exposure**” (RME) scenario is calculated that portrays the highest level of human exposure reasonably expected to occur. A “**central tendency exposure**” (CTE) scenario may also be considered to describe median, rather than the upper limit, exposures.

Step 3: Assess Toxicity

In Step 3, the Navy compiles information on the toxicity of the COPCs. The toxicity assessment defines the relationship between the magnitude of exposure and possible severity of adverse effects, and weighs the quality of available toxicological evidence. Two types of adverse effects are evaluated: carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic. For noncarcinogenic effects, information evaluated includes the type of noncarcinogenic effect that is associated with exposure (for example, exposure that could result in liver damage).

Step 4: Characterize Site Risk

In Step 4, the Navy combines the information gathered in the previous steps to evaluate whether exposure to site contaminants is sufficient to cause health effects in people exposed to the site contamination. The results of the three previous steps are combined, evaluated, and summarized. The likelihood of any kind of cancer resulting from exposure to chemicals at a site is generally expressed as an upper-bound probability, for example, a “1 in 10,000 chance.” In other words, for every 10,000 people that could be exposed, one extra individual may develop cancer as a result of exposure to site contaminants. For non-carcinogenic health effects, a “**hazard index**” (HI) is calculated. The key concept here is that a “threshold level” exists below which noncarcinogenic health effects are not expected to occur, even in sensitive receptors. For noncarcinogenic health effects, the HI can be added based on the particular effect or target organ (for example, if exposure to two or more COPCs at a site would all affect the liver in some way, these are summed for a liver-specific HI).

Each receptor listed above represents different exposure scenarios, which ultimately provide for a range of estimated exposures and risks. The receptor with the maximum potential exposure and risk is the future resident (adult and child) because this receptor would experience longer periods of exposure and might have more and longer contact with site media. The inclusion of future residents as potential receptors provides a conservative assessment of the risk because Site 3 is not currently used for residential purposes, and there are no plans to convert this site to residential use in the future.

The HHRA assumed that all receptors could potentially be exposed to site-related contaminants in soil and groundwater through the following exposure pathways:

- Ingestion – incidental eating of soil or ingestion of groundwater used as a drinking water supply (future resident only)
- Dermal Contact – incidental skin contact with soil, skin contact with groundwater during bathing or showering (future resident only), or working in an excavation (future construction worker only)
- Inhalation – breathing of vapors from surface soil and dust that become airborne; none of the COPCs (see the following) for groundwater were volatile, and therefore, the inhalation of volatiles from groundwater was not evaluated

The first step in the HHRA process consisted of screening chemicals detected in soil and groundwater to identify a list of COPCs. The maximum detected concentrations were compared to risk-based screening levels to identify the COPCs. Based on the screening of soil samples collected during the SI, ESI, and RI, the COPCs for soil at Site 3 are as follows:

- COPCs for surface soil
 - PCBs (Aroclor-1260)
 - Metals (aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, cobalt, iron, and thallium)

- COPCs for combined surface/subsurface soil
 - PCBs (Aroclor-1260)
 - Metals (aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, chromium [hexavalent], cobalt, iron, manganese, and thallium)

Based on the screening of groundwater samples collected during the ESI, the COPCs for groundwater at Site 3 are as follows:

- Metals (aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, chromium [assuming hexavalent], cobalt, iron, manganese, and thallium)

The Navy then developed quantitative risk estimates for these COPCs for each potential receptor to determine if the COPCs are present at concentrations that would result in unacceptable health risks. RME risks were calculated for each potential receptor in the HHRA.

Quantitative estimates of noncarcinogenic hazards and **carcinogenic risks** (HIs and Incremental Lifetime Cancer Risks, respectively) were developed for potential human receptors contacting site environmental media. Media and COPCs that contribute to risk estimates exceeding MDE’s cumulative cancer risk benchmark of 1×10^{-5} and the upper bound of EPA’s target risk range of 1×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-6} or an HI of 1 are identified. Although the noncarcinogenic hazard to a future child resident and carcinogenic risk to future lifetime resident exceeded target risk levels, when considering background concentrations, there were no unacceptable site-related noncarcinogenic hazards or carcinogenic risks associated with Site 3, and no COCs were identified for soil or groundwater at Site 3.

6.2 Ecological Risks from Exposure to Soil

An ERA was conducted for Site 3 as part of the Final RI Report and is summarized in the following. For detailed information regarding the ERA, please refer to the Final RI Report (available in the Administrative Record Information Repository).

Chemicals detected in the soil were evaluated by the ERA following the process outlined in the text box titled “**What is Ecological Risk and How is it Calculated?**” The ERA evaluated Aroclor-1260 in surface soil at Site 3. Based on the initial screening of the chemical data, Aroclor-1260 was initially selected as a COPC because the detected concentration exceeded conservative screening levels for plants and the short-tailed shrew (that is, Aroclor-1260 had an ecological effects quotient greater than 1.0 in the conservative food chain model).

The risk posed by Aroclor-1260 was further evaluated using a variety of lines of evidence to weigh the likelihood of risk. Based on the refined evaluation, Aroclor-1260 was not retained as a COC for potential risks to terrestrial plants, soil invertebrates, mammals, or birds at Site 3.

No ecological risks are predicted from contact with groundwater at Site 3 because ecological receptors are not exposed to groundwater.

7 Proposed Action

The Navy, with the support of MDE, proposes No Action for soil and groundwater at Site 3. No Action is proposed because there is no evidence that exposure to the soil or groundwater at Site 3 would result in unacceptable risks to human health or ecological receptors that would warrant **remedial action** under any land use, including unrestricted land use.

What is Ecological Risk and How Is It Calculated?

An ERA evaluates the potential adverse effects that exposure to site-related contaminants could have on the plants, invertebrates, and animals that make up ecosystems. The CERCLA ecological risk assessment process follows a phased approach similar to that of the HHRA. The risk assessment results are used to help determine what measures, if any, are necessary to protect plants and animals.

The ERA process includes three steps:

Step 1: Problem Formulation

The problem formulation establishes the goals, scope, and focus of the ERA and includes:

- Compiling and reviewing existing information on the habitats, plants, and animals that are present on the site
- Identifying and characterizing area(s) where site-related chemicals may be found
- Evaluating how plants and animals may be exposed to site-related chemicals through the development of a conceptual site model (CSM)
- Evaluating potential movement (transport) of chemicals in the environment
- Evaluating routes of exposure (for example, ingestion)
- Identifying receptors (plants and animals that could be exposed)
- Identifying relevant exposure media (for example, soil)
- Developing endpoints for how the risk will be measured for all complete and significant pathways (determining the risk where plants and/or animals can be exposed to site-related chemicals)

Step 2: Analysis

The second step of the ERA is risk analysis, in which potential exposures to plants and animals are estimated and the concentrations of chemicals at which an adverse effect may occur are determined.

Step 3: Risk Characterization

The third step in the ERA is risk characterization, in which all of the information identified in the first two steps is used to estimate the potential risk to plants and animals. Also included is an evaluation of the uncertainties (potential degree of error) that are associated with the predicted risks and their potential effects on the risk conclusions that have been made.

8 Community Participation

Community participation is a key component of the decision-making process for soil and groundwater at Site 3. Local individuals and others interested in Site 3 are encouraged to provide input on this Proposed Plan by using the public comment period to identify their concerns.

The 30-day public comment period for this Proposed Plan is May 15, 2026 through June 15, 2026. The public notice will be published in the local newspaper (*Calvert Recorder*), and at the public website: <https://go.usa.gov/xSeKn>. The location of the Public Information Repository is provided on **page 1** and is also provided at the NRL-CBD website.

All comments received during the comment period will be summarized, and responses will be provided in the DD, which is the document that will present the selected remedy and be included in the Administrative Record file.

Written comments can be submitted by mail or email and should be sent to the addresses shown below.

Submit Your Comments

During the comment period, interested parties may submit written comments to the following people:

Regina Adams, Public Affairs Officer

NAVFAC Washington
 1314 Harwood Street SE
 Washington, DC 20374
 Email: navfac_wash_publicaffairsoffice@us.navy.mil
 Phone: (202) 685-0384

For further information, you may also contact:

Linda Gustafson, Remedial Project Manager

Land and Materials Administration
 Maryland Department of the Environment
 1800 Washington Blvd, Suite 625
 Baltimore, MD 21230-1710
 Email: linda.gustafson@maryland.gov
 Phone: (410) 537-4238

9 References

The Administrative Record contains all the information used to select the preferred remedy for soil and groundwater at Site 3. It also provides important background and site investigation information in more detail than is presented in this Proposed Plan. The following is a list of the primary documents in the Administrative Record where pertinent site-related information can be obtained:

CH2M HILL, Inc. (CH2M). 2016. *Base-wide Site Inspection Report Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment Chesapeake Beach, Maryland*. Final. June.

CH2M. 2017. *Groundwater Background Study Results, Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment, Chesapeake Beach, Maryland*. Final. December.

CH2M. 2020. *Base-wide Expanded Site Inspection Report Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment, Naval Research Laboratory, Chesapeake Beach, Maryland*. Final. April.

CH2M. 2026. *Sites 3, 4, and 5 Remedial Investigation Report, Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment, Chesapeake Beach, Maryland*. January.

Naval Energy and Environmental Support Activity (NEESA). 1984. *Initial Assessment Study of Naval Research Laboratory, Washington D.C.* March.

Tetra Tech. 2015. *Soil Background Study Report for Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment, Chesapeake Beach, Maryland*. March.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

- CSM = conceptual site model
- DGM = digital geophysical mapping
- EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- ESI = Expanded Site Inspection
- IAS = Initial Assessment Study
- NAVFAC = Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command
- Navy = Department of the Navy
- NRL-CBD = Naval Research Laboratory – Chesapeake Bay Detachment
- PCB = polychlorinated biphenyl
- SVOC = semivolatile organic compound
- VOC = volatile organic compound

10 Glossary of Terms

Administrative Record: A record made available to the public that includes all information considered and relied on in the selection of a remedy for a site.

Background concentration: Amount of chemical substances that is representative of the area surrounding the site and not attributable to a single identifiable source.

Carcinogenic risk: The risk that a person will develop cancer, expressed as a number reflecting the increased chance that a person will develop cancer if exposed to a contaminant.

Central tendency exposure (CTE): The median or average exposure within the potential exposed population at the site.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA): Also known as the Superfund Law, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986. CERCLA provides the authority and procedures for responding to releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants from inactive hazardous waste disposal sites.

Constituent of concern (COC): Chemicals that are site-related and pose a potential risk to human health, the environment, or leaching to groundwater.

Constituent of potential concern (COPC): Compound or analyte identified early in the risk assessment process needed for more detailed evaluation to determine the potential for risk to human health and exposed organisms.

Contamination: Any physical, biological, or radiological substance or matter that at a great enough concentration could have an adverse effect on human health or the environment.

Decision Document (DD): An official public document that explains which cleanup alternative(s) will be used at an environmentally contaminated site. The DD is based on information and technical analysis generated during the RI/focused feasibility study and consideration of public comments and community concerns. The DD explains the remedy selection process and is issued by the Navy, in consultation with MDE, following the public comment period.

Ecological risk: The chance of harmful effects posed to ecological receptors such as plants and animals from exposure to existing concentrations of chemicals detected at a site.

Ecological risk assessment (ERA): An evaluation of the potential health risks posed to plants and animals from exposure to analytes in soils, sediments, surface water, and/or groundwater.

Groundwater: Water beneath the ground surface that fills pore spaces between materials such as sand, soil, or gravel to the point of saturation. Groundwater may transport substances that have percolated downward from the ground surface as it flows toward its point of discharge.

Hazard index (HI): Indicates the noncarcinogenic health risk to an individual from the presence of multiple substances at one site or exposures to the same chemicals through multiple media and pathways. The HI may be summed by each specific target organ or critical effect.

Human health risk: The chance of harmful effects posed to people from exposure to existing concentrations of chemicals detected at a site.

Human health risk assessment (HHRA): An evaluation of the potential health risks posed to people from exposure to existing concentrations of chemicals and metals detected at a site.

Information Repository: A file containing information, technical reports, and reference documents regarding a National Priority List site. This file is usually maintained in a place with easy public access, such as a public library.

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE): The regulatory agency that preserves the state’s air, water, and land resources and safeguards the environmental health of Maryland’s citizens. MDE’s duties include enforcement of environmental laws and regulations, long-term planning and research, and providing technical assistance to state industry and communities for pollution, growth issues, and environmental emergencies.

Media: Air, surface soil, subsurface soil, groundwater, surface water, or sediments that are the subject of regulatory concern, investigation, and cleanup.

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP): The NCP provides the organizational structure and procedures for preparing for and responding to discharges of oil and releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants.

No Action: No actions are required to accomplish proposed site cleanup.

Proposed Plan: A public participation requirement of CERCLA (Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act), in which the lead agency summarizes for the public the preferred cleanup strategy. The Proposed Plan may be prepared either as a fact sheet or as a more detailed document.

Public comment period: A time for the public to review and comment on various documents and actions taken by either the Navy or MDE. A minimum 30-day comment period is held to allow community members to review the Administrative Record file and review and comment on the Proposed Plan.

Public meeting: Meeting where the lead agency presents and discusses the Proposed Plan and accepts written and oral comments and questions from the community members.

Reasonable maximum exposure (RME): The highest exposure that is reasonably expected to occur at a site, and it is intended to estimate a conservative exposure case (that is, well above the average case) that is still within the range of possible exposures.

Remedial action: The execution of a selected remedy to accomplish proposed site cleanup.

Remedial Investigation (RI): An in-depth study designed to gather data needed to determine the nature and extent of contamination at a site and to evaluate the potential risks posed by exposure of people, plants, and animals to the contamination.

Response action: As defined by CERCLA, a removal or remedial action, including related enforcement activities.

Responsiveness Summary: A summary of oral and written public comments received by the lead agency during a comment period and the responses to the comments prepared by the lead agency. The Responsiveness Summary is an important part of the DD, highlighting community concerns for decision makers.

Risk assessment: A study on the chance of harmful effects posed to people, plants, and animals from exposure to existing levels of contamination.

Sediment: Saturated soil, such as silt, sand, gravel, or chemical precipitates, that is transported and deposited by water, ice, or wind.

Site Inspection (SI): A preliminary study designed to gather data to determine the types of contamination that may be at a site.

Subsurface soil: Any soil below the top 6 inches.

Superfund: The program operated under CERCLA legislative authority that carries out solid waste, emergency, and long-term removal and remedial activities. These activities include investigating sites for inclusion on the National Priorities List, determining site priority, and conducting and/or supervising the cleanup and other remedial actions.

Surface soil: The top 6 inches of soil.

Surface water: Water found on the surface of the earth, such as in a river, lake, wetland, or ocean.

Please print your comments here and/or return via one of the methods listed below

Name: _____

Affiliation (group/agency): _____

Address: _____

Submit comments or questions to:

**Regina Adams,
Public Affairs Officer**

NAVFAC Washington
1314 Harwood Street SE
Washington, DC 20374

navfac_wash_publicaffairsoffice@
us.navy.mil

(202) 685-0384



Regina Adams
Public Affairs Officer
NAVFAC Washington
1314 Harwood Street SE
Washington, DC 20374