06.01-07/18/97-01561

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
Marine Corps Air Station
Cherry Point, North Carolina 28533-0006

5090/14236I
LN
18 Jul 97

Mr. Tom Sandy
CH2MHILL
4824 Parkway Plaza Boulevard
Suite 200
Charlotte, North Carolina 28217

Dear Mr. Sandy:

The following comments are provided by MCAS Cherry Point on the draft Regulatory Assessment for Groundwater Remediation. Identification of the individual who generated each comment is provided.

1. Page 2 - Groundwater Remediation Activities, OU1:

a. Last sentence - "The groundwater MAY BE considered to be a RCRA hazardous water..." instead of IS considered to be a RCRA hazardous waste. Glenn Hartzog (EAD)

2. Page 2 - Groundwater Remediation Activities, UST:

a. First sentence - Groundwater contamination is from LUST's, abandoned refueling system and active refueling system. Primary contamination is from JP-5 fuel. Bill Powers (EAD)

b. Last sentence - Unlikely that TCLP for Benzene would be exceeded from JP-5 contaminants. Bill Powers (EAD)

3. Page 3 - Objective, first sentence - UST groundwater is remediated under NCAC, Title 15A, Subchapter 2L. This means that the State groundwater section has authority over UST cleanups. Objectives are laid out in the State Regulations. Bill Powers (EAD)

4. Page 3 - Treatment Alternatives:

a. Following bulleted items, third sentence - The decision to treat off-gas generated from the equilization/stripper component of options 1, 2, and 3 with a catalytic thermal oxidizer has not been decided. In fact, it appears that a catalytic thermal oxidizer will not be required. See comments 7a, 7b, 8a, and 8b. John Myers (EAD)

b. The most likely option will be to provide separated water to the IWTP for further treatment. Various scenarios are being analyzed to provide the cleanest water possible and at a rate that will allow treatment. Bill Powers (EAD)

5. Page 4 - Treatment Alternatives: The rate will be reducible to 100 gpm. Discussions need to be held on whether there will be flexibility to exceed this rate if excess volume can be utilized. Bill Powers (EAD)

6. Page 5 - Current Permits, paragraph 2, third sentence: "...Neuse River which is classified as Class SB-NSW...." instead of SC-NSW. Glenn Hartzog (EAD)

7. Page 7 - Prevention of Significant Deterioration:

a. Although the Air Station is a major stationary source under PSD, we do not agree with your assumption that a "significant" increase in emissions would result from the emission of 1 tpy of vinyl chloride. Under 40 CFR, 52.21 (23) (i) "significant means", the vinyl chloride emission rate is listed as l tpy; however, according to a March 11, 1991 memo from the EPA's Office of Air Quality and Planning Standards, "...the following pollutants, which had been regulated under PSD because they were covered by the section 112 NESHAPS or section 111 new source performance standards (NSPS) program, are now exempt from PSD applicability: arsenic, asbestos, benzene, beryllium, hydrogen sulfide, mercury, radionuclides, and **vinyl chloride** ". Orathai Bulfer (EAD)

b. The statement regarding the 40 tpy of VOCs is correct and would trigger a significant increase in emissions. The Air Station will refine emission estimates on VOCs instead of using conservatively based figures in order to avoid the potential of triggering PSD. Orathai Bulfer (EAD)

8. Page 9 - NC Toxic Air Pollutant (TAP) Permit:

a. The Air Station has met with and received memos from the North Carolina Department of Environment Management (NCDEM), Air Quality Permitting Branch (now the North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources; Air Quality Division (AQD)) specifically regarding permitting requirements of soil and groundwater remediation systems at Navy and Marine Corps facilities within North Carolina. The conclusions state that, "...Air toxics requirements of 15A NCAC 2D.1100 and 2H.0610 are only applicable to sources that are required to meet another applicable requirement in 15A NCAC 2D Sections .500, .0900, and .1200. Since there are no applicable requirements to soil and groundwater remediation systems, these regulations do not apply. However, if the "facility" had previously triggered the air toxics regulations for other reasons, the air toxics from the remediation systems would need to be evaluated on a "compound specific basis". Orathai Bulfer (EAD)

b. The Air Station sent a request to the NCDEM asking for review and clarification of the requirements to address air toxics for which a facility had been previously evaluated in October 1996. It was the position of the Air Station that since we were absent any facility-wide modeling data or a regulatory driver to complete a facility-wide modeling evaluation there is little or no pertinence in evaluating individual remediation systems. The latest guidance as of July 3, 1997 is:

* The remediation systems cannot be exempt from permitting. However, there are no applicable requirements therefore, even though the unit might emit air toxics the unit does not trigger a review.

5090/14236I
LN

Pursuant to 2H.0610(5) there must be some other 2D requirement to apply to the source before air toxics can apply.

* To summarize, all the Air Station must do is describe the source and the control (if any) and pay an air permit modification fee of $760. Orathai Bulfer (EAD)

9. Page 10 - I am confused about what CH2M Hill is trying to say. For example, in paragraph 1, what kind of wastewater is being referenced...OU1 GW? routine NADEP/flightline thruput? or HW sent over by NADEP in carboys for batch treatment? Regardless, our understanding of the regulations is that the IWTP is a wastewater treatment unit (as defined in 40 CFR 260.10) covered by Section 307(b) of the CWA and as such provides an exclusion (40 CFR 270.1(c)(2)(v) from RCRA permitting (the IWTP sludges excepted). In the second paragraph...If our wastewater has already escaped RCRA (preceding comment), how do Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR's) apply? Besides, we are not "land disposing" wastewater. Please correct me if I am wrong with RCRA chapter and verse. Glenn Hartzog (EAD)

10. Page 12 - Table 3, Benzene: Note that this is a worse case scenario and the levels shown will not be levels seen at the treatment plant. Bill Powers (EAD)

11. Page 14 - Conclusions and Recommendations:

a. Clean Water Act, bullet item #2 - Please delete the words "pretreatment limits" after FFCA. This slight change perhaps leaves us with a little more flexibility should we choose in the future to argue for site specific limits rather than accepting national pretreatment standards. Glenn Hartzog (EAD)

12. Clean Water Act, paragraph 3, second sentence - "Pretreatment limits derived from this analysis should then be FORWARDED TO DWQ and EPA Region IV." instead of REVIEWED BY DWQ and EPA. This change in wording better reflects our policy of telling the regulator what we are going to do rather than asking them to render an opinion. Glenn Hartzog (EAD)

If you have any questions or need clarification please contact me at (919) 466-4903.

John Myers
Physical Environmental Scientist

Copy to:
Joanna Curlin (FMD)
Chris Kartman (EAD)
Bill Powers (EAD)
Glenn Hartzog (EAD)
Orathai Bulfer (EAD)
Steve Bivone OHM Remedial Services
Steve Huges, Brown and Root Environmental
Lance Laughmiller, LandDiv