

**RESPONSES TO EPA's COMMENTS
DRAFT FINAL FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR
STUDY AREAS 01 AND 04 AND SITES 02 AND 03
NCBC DAVISVILLE, RHODE ISLAND**

The following Navy responses pertain to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region I comments on the Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS) for Installation Restoration (IR) Program Site 02 (CED Battery Acid Disposal Area) and Site 03 (CED Solvent Disposal Area), and Study Area 01 (CED Drum Storage Area) and Study Area 04 (CED Asphalt Disposal Area). EPA's comments are dated 15 November 2000. EPA's additional comments that were provided on 27 November 2000 are also addressed in this response document.

GENERAL COMMENTS

COMMENT NO. 1—The disposition of ground-water contamination at the subject sites has not been clearly documented with respect to several issues. Throughout the report, it is stated that a major source of volatile organic compound (VOC) contamination is associated with the Nike missile site located west of the subject sites. It is also stated that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has assumed responsibility for the investigation of this source under the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) program. Additional source investigations and an evaluation of offsite ground-water impacts are planned. As a result, remedial actions regarding ground-water contamination at Sites 02 and 03, and Study Areas 01 and 04 have been dismissed by the Navy in the subject feasibility study (FS) report. The following concerns are presented to support the need for additional consideration of appropriate ground-water actions in the subject report.

- It is not clear in the text whether the USACE has agreed to assume responsibility for the investigation and remediation of the entire ground-water plume underlying the site. Based on the information presented in the subject report, it appears that at least three other, relatively minor, VOC source areas exist within close proximity of the subject sites. It is plausible that the USACE's investigations could determine that the Nike site is not the only source of the contamination, which could cause the USACE to defer a portion of the ground-water actions to the Navy. It is recommended that the agreement between the Navy and the USACE regarding the responsibility and scope of ground-water investigations and actions be clearly delineated in the FS report.
- Ground-water investigations at Site 02 identified concentrations of semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs) near the former refueling area. Ground-water investigations at the sites identified lead and nickel at concentrations above federal or state standards. Arsenic was identified as a ground-water chemical of concern (COC) in the human health risk assessment (HHRA). At this time, these contaminants are not attributed to the contamination associated with the Nike site, therefore, it is unlikely that these compounds will be addressed as part of the overall remedy for the Nike site.

- Therefore, an interim remedial action plan of ground-water restrictions and monitoring should be proposed, rather than no action. The Navy must wait for an acceptable plan to control the offsite source to be in place before a final plan can be proposed for the sites.

Response—The Navy notes EPA's concerns and will defer the issuance of the FS and Proposed Plan. A future agreement between the Navy and USACE regarding the roles and responsibilities of remedial actions on Navy property will be established once the USACE has completed the Nike Site remedial investigation (RI)/FS and prior to submission of a USACE Remedial Action Work Plan for regulatory approval. In order to address EPA concerns of potential non-Nike related source areas in the vicinity of Building 224, additional Navy sponsored monitoring will be conducted on a yearly basis and reported to the BCT. Upon completion of the USACE RI/FS, the Navy will submit a "revised" Draft Final FS that will include the additional Navy sponsored ground-water monitoring data and recommendations for Navy sponsored remedial action(s) as appropriate.

The Navy, on a one-time basis, agreed to assist the USACE by installing and sampling 5 new bedrock wells, as well as sampling all existing wells on Navy property that are potentially impacted by the USACE upgradient VOC source area. The Navy made this accommodation to the Army to speed the process of the USACE RI and eventual FS, as the upgradient VOC source area precludes execution of a Proposed Plan that allows for transfer of the impacted portion of Navy property. The Navy acknowledges that a smaller source area(s) may be present at the subject sites (e.g., potentially at Site 03); however, smaller source areas have not been identified within the larger overall VOC plume migrating onto Navy property.

Although SVOCs have been detected in soil and ground water at the former refueling area at Site 02, the Phase II RI concluded that these SVOC concentrations did not exceed federal or state standards. The arsenic, lead, and nickel detected in ground water do not require remediation because they do not present an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. The Navy has completed an HHRA that included an evaluation of these inorganic constituents. Nickel was not identified as a chemical of potential concern (COPC) in ground water, and so was not of concern for human health at the site. Arsenic in ground water was not a risk driver and was within the EPA's acceptable target risk range of from 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} for all receptors (including daycare child). The risk-based PRGs for these constituents would be lower than their maximum detected concentrations. The Navy's "Ecological Risk Evaluation Technical Memorandum" (ERA Tech Memo; EA 2000) identified no unacceptable ecological risks from the conditions at the subject sites.

The Navy has not proposed No Further Action. The FS presented two alternatives: (1) No Action (as required by the National Contingency Plan) and (2) Ground-Water Use Restriction and Long-Term Monitoring. The FS indicated that Alternative 1 would not be acceptable.

COMMENT NO. 2—A primary component of the proposed remedial alternatives is the implementation of institutional controls (land use restrictions) at the site to restrict ground-water use. The mechanism for implementing the land use controls over time must be identified to ensure that the controls can be enforced, both currently under the Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance (Lease) and in the future planned deed transfer. At Navy facilities in EPA Regions 3 and 4, the use of formal Land Use Control Action Plans (LUCAPs) and Land Use Control Implementation Plans (LUCIPs) was developed to provide a mechanism for the controls in lieu of deed restrictions. An understanding of the proposed mechanisms for the assessment and effectiveness of land use controls is necessary to support the evaluation of the controls as a component of the remedial alternatives.

Currently, §13.11 of the Lease states that “The Lessee shall not conduct or permit its sublessees to conduct any subsurface excavation, digging, drilling or other disturbance of the surface without the prior written approval of the Government’s Authorized Contraction Officer.” This section should be modified to specifically include ground-water use restrictions and to include notification of the Navy, EPA, and RIDEM prior to the ground water being used and prior to the disturbance of the surface. (Regarding § 13.12, has the RIEDC recently subleased any more space to tenants under this Lease?)

Response—A LUCIP will be developed and implemented prior to transfer of the property. In addition, the current wording of the lease effectively prevents ground-water use by not allowing digging or drilling. A ground-water use restriction will be identified specifically as a deed covenant concurrent with the issuance of a Finding of Suitability to Transfer for the property.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

COMMENT NO. 1: Executive Summary, Page ES-7—Add at the end a new last paragraph: “The evaluation discusses how Alternative 1 is neither protective of human health and the environment nor complies with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, since it does not address risks present on the Site. This study finds that Alternative 2 does not directly address the offsite threats present from contaminated ground water under the Site. However, it does address all NCP criteria on an interim basis, by including restrictions on ground-water use, long-term monitoring, and 5-year reviews. This Alternative may serve as an interim remedy until such time as the offsite source is adequately addressed.”

Response—See response to General Comment No. 1.

COMMENT NO. 2: Section 1.2.6 Background Information, Related Areas of Concern, Former Nike PR-58 Site, Page 1-7—The intent of the last sentence of the section regarding the location of the storm drain lines and the ground-water table is unclear. A few sentences earlier, it is stated that a portion of the storm drains at the Nike site is below the ground-water table. It is recommended that this sentence be revised.

Response—The last sentence will be revised to say: “Additionally, the storm water drainage lines beneath NCBC Davisville downgradient of the former Nike site are located above the ground-water table and, therefore, VOC migrating with ground water from the Nike site should not have infiltrated the Navy’s stormwater drainage lines.”

COMMENT NO. 3: Section 1.2.7.3, Background Information, Remedial Investigations, Phase II RI (TRC 1994b), Ground Water, Page 1-12—The section indicates that SVOC ground-water contamination related to the underground storage tank (UST) farm and refueling area was identified at Site 02. No further discussion regarding this contamination could be found in the report nor were any UST investigations or removals referenced. It has not been shown in this report whether the SVOC contamination was included in the risk assessments for the site or considered during the development of the potential remedial goals.

- If the petroleum contamination is planned to be addressed or was addressed under a separate program, this information should be provided to document the fact that all site-related contamination has been addressed. If the petroleum contamination in ground water is mixed with contamination from other sources, then actions performed in compliance with state UST programs may not have addressed CERCLA issues.
- As stated in the general comment above, the SVOCs detected at Site 02 are not currently attributed to the Nike source area and, therefore, it may be prudent for the Navy to consider developing ground-water remedial options to address the contamination.
- It is recommended that additional information be provided in the FS report to ensure that the SVOC contamination has been adequately addressed during the investigations at Site 02 and to ensure that any proposed ground-water remedial alternatives effectively address these constituents.

Response—The conditions at the former refueling area will be clarified in the FS and a reference to the “Underground Storage Tank Closure Report” (TRC 1992) will be added. As shown in the Phase II RI, some petroleum-related compounds were detected; however, these concentrations in soil and ground water did not exceed regulatory criteria. Also, as stated in the FS, a HHRA was completed for ground water as part of the Phase III RI and SVOC and VOC data were included in that Phase III RI risk assessment. A reference to the Phase III RI HHRA will be added to this section for clarity.

In 1992, the Navy removed the USTs. Subsequent sampling of wells in the area detected concentrations below regulatory criteria, suggesting no remediation is required. It is proposed that an additional round of sampling be conducted at the former refueling area to confirm that fuel-related compounds have abated since the tank removal. Based on the results of this additional sampling round, the Navy will

consider whether or not to add these fuel-related compounds and specific monitoring wells to the long-term monitoring program.

COMMENT NO. 4: Section 1.2.7.3, Background Information, Remedial Investigations, Phase II RI (TRC 1994b), Ground Water, Page 1-13—The section states that lead and nickel were detected in ground water at Site 03 at concentrations in excess of federal or state standards. Lead was also detected in MW03-01S at a concentration in excess of the federal action level. Neither the concentrations of the metals nor the regulatory criteria are provided in the text. Additionally, it is not stated whether the metals contamination was included in the risk assessments for the site or considered during the development of the potential remedial goals. It is recommended that further discussion regarding the concentrations and significance of the metals contamination at Site 03 be provided to ensure that they have been adequately considered prior to the development of the remedial alternatives.

Response—As stated in the response to the 2nd bullet of General Comment No. 1, metals in ground water were evaluated in the Phase III RI risk assessment. An additional reference to the Phase III RI HHRA will be added to this section for clarification. The concentrations of the metals and their regulatory criteria will also be added to the text.

COMMENT NO. 5: Section 1.2.7.4, Background Information, Study Area Screening Evaluation, Page 1-18—The first and second bullets include summaries of analytical data for soils and sediments. This data included references to inorganic data (i.e., lead, mercury) using the $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ units of measure. Inorganic data for soils and sediments are typically expressed in mg/kg units. Additionally, the cited values appear to be typical values for the mg/kg units. It is recommended that the data be verified and corrected in the text, if necessary.

Response—In the first bullet (protection of ground water), the units for the concentration of mercury will be corrected to $4.8 \text{ mg}/\text{kg}$. Lead is already correctly shown as $205 \text{ mg}/\text{kg}$. The units for methylene chloride in subsurface soil will be corrected to $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$. The remaining inorganic concentrations in the first bullet are for water samples and are correctly shown in units of $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$.

In the second bullet (for catch basin samples), the inorganic constituent concentrations (cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, and zinc) will be changed to units of mg/kg . The units of $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ had been carried over from an error in a table from the original Study Area Screening Evaluation report.

Also for the summaries of the Study Area Screening Evaluation data, "J" qualifiers will be added where applicable.

COMMENT NO. 6: Section 1.2.7.4, Background Information, Study Area Screening Evaluation, Page 1-18—The first and second bullets present data from onsite soils and catch basin sediment at Study Area 01. Several of the contaminants detected onsite were

also detected in the catch basins indicating a partially complete pathway. The sediments within the catch basins reportedly exceeded ecological screening criteria. The final sentence in the second bullet states that inorganic analytes detected in Allen Harbor near the storm drain outfall exhibited concentrations an order of magnitude higher than the concentrations detected within the catch basins. This trend could indicate that contaminated soils from the site have migrated from the site to Allen Harbor via the storm drains. No further discussion of sediments is provided in the report nor is any discussion of any other sampling in the harbor. It is recommended that additional information be presented in the report discussing the presence of contaminated sediments in the catch basins and their potential impact on the harbor. Without additional justification, the remediation of sediments from the catch basins and storm sewers must be considered as well as their impact to Allen Harbor. The Navy should discuss and reference investigations that address this issue.

Response—Additional discussion of the Study Area 01 catch basins and their connection to Allen Harbor will be included in the FS. Based on the results of previous investigations, the remedial alternatives presented in the FS do not need to address the catch basins at Study Area 01.

The “Study Area Screening Evaluation” for Study Area 01 (Halliburton NUS 1994) concluded that “the small quantities of sediment present in the catch basins, in conjunction with the low inorganic contaminant concentrations in the catch basin sediments, appear to represent a minimal risk to Allen Harbor receptors.” Additionally, the “Facility-Wide Freshwater/Terrestrial Ecological Risk Assessment” (EA 1996) concluded that, although there is some low potential risk, there are no observable toxicological effects on the benthic community within the Allen Harbor Watershed. The “Ecological Risk Evaluation Technical Memorandum” (EA 2000) identified no unacceptable risks at Study Area 01. Finally, the “Addendum Report for Additional Allen Harbor Wetlands Sediment Samples” (EA 1996) concluded that the wetland area to which the Study Area 01 catch basins discharge to are “clearly less impacted in terms of sediment chemical concentrations than any other area in the Allen Harbor watershed.” EPA’s related comment letter of 11 September 1996 agreed with the report’s conclusion that the chemical concentrations detected in these additional samples would not appreciably alter the findings of the food chain modeling (watershed-based or EEZ-based) evaluations contained in the “Facility-Wide Ecological Risk Assessment.”

COMMENT NO. 7: Section 1.2.7.4, Background Information, Study Area Screening Evaluation, Page 1-19—The first and second bullets on this page detail sampling results from the asphalt disposal area. The results indicate that in addition to PAH compounds, metals including lead, mercury, beryllium and other contaminants are present. The last bullet describes the removal effort and PCB/TPH confirmation sampling in the area designed to meet RIDEM criteria. The HHRA identified aluminum and PCBs as COCs for this area (Tables 1-5 and 1-6) and PRGs were developed for lead and PCBs (Table 2-1 and 2-2). It is not shown in the text whether the HHRA considered the other metals at the site and if those contaminants were considered during the development of the

PRGs. It is recommended that the revised FS report include a list of all the COCs that were considered in the risk assessments to ensure that the risks from all contaminants detected during previous investigations at the site were addressed. If risks for these contaminants were not calculated, then additional risk assessment work may be required to ensure the appropriate PRGs are considered in the FS.

Response—COPCs include all the chemicals which are evaluated in the risk assessment for potential risk. COCs are chemicals that have been determined to have potential risk by the risk assessment. All detected metals were considered in the risk assessment in the determination of COPCs. The FS presents a summary of the results of the risk assessment and is not intended to restate the entire evaluation. The reviewer should refer to the screening tables of the risk assessment (Tables 2.X of the HHRA from November 2000) which are presented by medium. These list all of the detected chemicals, their risk-based screening concentrations, and the rationale for selection or deletion as a COPC.

COMMENT NO. 8: Section 1.4.1.1, Findings and Conclusions of Previous Investigations, Volatile Organic Compounds, Ground Water, Page 1-28—The last sentence of the second paragraph states that the only identified subsurface VOC source area was located at the Nike site. The statement is somewhat misleading in that other source areas were identified during previous investigations around Building 224. It is recommended that this statement be modified to reflect that other VOC source areas exist at the Navy Site.

Response—Previous ground-water investigations in the vicinity of Building 224 ultimately led to the discovery of increasing VOC concentrations as the investigation expanded to the west on Navy property and subsequently onto the former Nike Site, where the highest total VOC concentrations were detected. Exceedences of VOC criteria have been detected on Navy property, but a major distinguishable Navy source area for VOCs in ground water has not been conclusively identified. See response to General Comment No. 1.

COMMENT NO. 9: Section 2.5, Remedial Action Objectives, Page 2-7—As stated in a previous comment, analysis of Study Area 01 catch basin sediments exhibited exceedences of ecological screening criteria and indicate that the storm sewers may be a complete migration pathway from the site to Allen Harbor. It is recommended that the Remedial Action Objectives also address this pathway, or the Navy should provide documentation that this pathway has been evaluated and found to not have impacted the watershed.

Response—See response to Specific Comment No. 6.

COMMENT NO. 10: Section 3.1.1, Alternative 1: No Action, Page 3-1—Add a new last sentence: "Alternative 1 will not be protective of human health and the environment since it does not address risks present on the Site and does not comply with chemical-specific ARARs that require that the contaminated ground water be addressed."

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly.

COMMENT NO. 11: Section 3.1.2, Alternative 2, Page 3-1—Change the first sentence to: “Alternative 2 cannot address the offsite source of ground-water contamination entering the Site. Until the source is adequately addressed, Alternative 2 will be protective of human health and the environment on an interim basis through the following remedial components.”

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly (also as per response to General Comment No. 1).

COMMENT NO. 12: Section 3.2.2, Alternative 2, Pages 3-3 through 3-4—These sections need to be revised to state that they will address the risks present at the Site on an interim basis only until the offsite source is adequately addressed.

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly (also as per response to General Comment No. 1).

COMMENT NO. 13: Section 3.2.2.3, Cost—This estimates includes a capital cost of \$18,000, however, there is no basis for this cost in the report. It is recommended that brief description of the costs be included in the report to support an evaluation.

Response—Table 4-2 already indicates that the cost of \$18,000 pertains to the implementation of a ground-water use restriction.

COMMENT NO. 14: Section 4.7, Comparison of Remedial Alternatives, Page 4-7—The previous section is 4.4.2.7. Therefore, several sections seem to have been removed. Please re-number the section.

Response—Comment noted. The section numbers will be corrected.

COMMENT NO. 15: Section 4.3.2.2 Alternative 2, Compliance with ARARs, Page 4-3—Change the sentence to: “Alternative 1 does not satisfy chemical-specific ARARs under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act which requires risks posed by contaminated ground water to be addressed.”

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly.

COMMENT NO. 16: Section 4.4 Evaluation of Alternative 2, Pages 4-4 through 4-7—The discussions under each relevant subsection need to be revised to state that the criteria will be met only on an interim basis until the offsite source is addressed. Change this also throughout Table 4-3.

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly (also as per response to General Comment No. 1).

COMMENT NO. 17: Section 4.4.1, Alternative 2, Page 4-4—Change the first sentence to: “Alternative 2 can not address the offsite source of ground-water contamination entering the Site. Until the source is adequately addressed, Alternative 2 will be protective of human health and the environment on an interim basis through the following remedial components.”

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly (also as per response to General Comment No. 1).

COMMENT NO. 18: Section 4.7.2 Compliance with ARARs, Page 4-8—Change the last sentence to: “Alternative 1 would not comply with chemical-specific ARARs.” Change this also in Table 4.3.

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly.

COMMENT NO. 19: Table 4-1 ARARs and TBCs—The FS should also include an ARAR table for the NO ACTION alternative. There should only be a chemical-specific ARAR, the Safe Drinking Water Act, which is applicable, with the same synopsis as the one provided in the Table 4-1 (action/monitoring) already. The insert for the column of “Action to Meet ARAR” should read: “The No Action Alternative does not comply since risks from ground water are not addressed.” There are no location-specific nor action-specific ARARs since no remedial action is proposed.

Response—Comment noted. The table will be added.

COMMENT NO. 20: Table 4-1 ARARs and TBCs—The Navy is proposing the same type of remedy as was agreed to at Calf Pasture Point (CPP), although this remedy will be interim. Therefore, the same ARAR tables should have been used as a model. The ARARs for Alternative 2 must be revised to state that they are only meeting the individual ARARs on an interim basis, until such time as the offsite source is addressed and the proposed remedial action re-evaluated. The CPP ROD ARAR tables do not include any chemical-specific ARARs since the Navy is not planning on cleaning up the aquifer. Likewise here at Sites 1-4, there is no plan to clean up the aquifer, only monitoring is proposed. Therefore, there should be no chemical-specific ARARs in the Alternative 2 ARAR table.

Response—The CPP ROD ARARs were used as a model for this FS. The chemical-specific ARARs shown in Table 4-1 of this FS that were not in the CPP ROD were included because of the additional HHRA that was conducted as part of the draft final FS. Now that the HHRA has been issued as a separate, stand-alone document, these chemical-specific ARARs will be removed from the FS. The text will be modified accordingly. See also response to General Comment No. 1 regarding potential modifications to the FS based on future ground-water monitoring data.

- The location-specific ARAR table must include the Federal and State Coastal Zone Management ARARs similar to the ones from the location-specific CPP ROD ARAR table since the entire coastal community is included in the coastal zone management area. Remove the Endangered Species Act unless endangered species actually on the Site (I believe the species are waterbirds which would not be in this area).

Response—In Rhode Island, that applicability of coastal zone management regulations is contained in Section 100 of *The State of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Program (CRMP)*, as amended 14 February 1995. Rhode Island's CRMP is not an ARAR for the IR Program activities at Sites 02 and 03 and Study Areas 01 and 04 because the subject area is: (1) not within a tidal water, (2) not a shoreline feature, (3) not within 200 ft of a shoreline feature, and (4) will not damage the environment of a coastal region.

The Endangered Species Act will be removed from the list of ARARs as requested.

- Add to each of the action-specific ARAR citations under Action to be Taken "This standard will be met on an interim basis. Final compliance with this standard will not be complete until the offsite source of ground-water contamination is addressed."

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly (also as per response to General Comment No. 1).

- In the action-specific ARAR table: For the State Rules and Regulations for Ground-Water Quality, change status to Relevant and Appropriate. In Synopsis, remove the last sentence. In the Action to be Taken change to: "Ground-water monitoring program will comply with the substantive standards of these regulations. More stringent federal standards will be used during the development of performance standards for ground water."

Response—Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly (also as per response to General Comment No. 1).

- The action-specific ARAR table should be changed to remove the RIDEM Site Remediation Regs, since the aquifer is classified as GB and the federal standards of the SDWA are far more stringent than the state GB standards.

Response—The State has classified ground water beneath the sites as GB. The Navy also agrees with EPA's previous assertion (7 July 2000) that the aquifer underlying the OU7 CED area should be classified as a low use aquifer in accordance with the Ground-Water Use and Value Determination guidance due to its low yield and lack of current and expected future use. However, as already shown in Table 4-1, the Navy shall consider both the SWDA and the RIDEM Remediation Regulations during the long-term monitoring program.

COMMENT NO. 21: Table 4-3—Change this table to reflect that Alternative 1 will not meet chemical-specific ARARs and that Alternative 2 will only meet the criteria on an interim basis until the offsite source is adequately addressed.

Response: Comment noted. The text will be modified accordingly (also as per response to General Comment No. 1).

ADDITIONAL EPA COMMENTS PROVIDED ON 27 NOVEMBER 2000

COMMENT NO. 22—I was notified that you didn't include a couple of references that should have been included in the report IAW the August 2000 RTC. Please include:

- **Comment No. 25**—A reference to the Risk Update No. 5 has not been included in the References section of the HHRA. As indicated in the August 2000 Response to Comments, please include the reference.

Response—The Navy provided the current HHRA as a separate document (“HHRA for Soil at Study Areas 01 and 04 with Summary of Previous Risk Assessment for IR Program Sites 02 and 03” by EA in November 2000). The Navy disagrees in the validity of background analyses utilizing the EPA’s Risk Update No. 5. The Navy has its own policy on the use of background chemical levels and their subsequent use in a risk assessment process. Although, for this HHRA, the Navy has chosen to apply the policy identified in Risk Update No. 5 at EPA’s request, the Navy does not intend to use it again.

- **Comment No. 26**—The response to this comment (August 2000) indicates that a Background Document was referenced in Appendix A of the FS. Upon review of the references in Appendix A, the specific Background Document is not apparent. For purposes of improved clarity, please provide the specific title, contractor and date of the document.

Response—Comment noted. The text will be clarified.

COMMENT NO. 23—In addition, references to “Background” still exist within the tables and the uncertainty section needs to be clarified. Please revise the document as noted below:

- **Comment Nos. 1 and 3**—It is agreed that the Navy will not use the background data to screen out COPCs. As future sites are concerned, the Navy and EPA will continue to discuss the inconsistencies between EPA policy and newly published Navy environmental assessment procedures. Reference to the background data remains in the risk assessment as evidenced by the Tables found in Section 2.X. The Uncertainties Section (2.6.2.1) discussing background should be changed from “it is probable that some of the calculated risks are contributed by naturally occurring background” to “it is possible that some of the calculated risks are contributed by naturally occurring background.”

- We have agreed to disagree, in this FS only, on the use of a 1254 surrogate to evaluate 1260 non-cancer risks since EPA does not have a written guidance requiring such an evaluation.
- We have also agreed, in this FS only, to allow Navy to determine COPCs from R9 risk based tables for residential and for commercial separately using R9 residential and industrial PRGs respectively. This is based on the information provided by the Navy that the R9 industrial PRGs are developed on a more conservative exposure scenario than the NCBC commercial exposure scenario.
- A question has been raised on the data usability evaluation. EPA typically only uses validated data in RI risk assessments, however, according to the RTC and the FS, data from study areas 1 and 4 were only evaluated, not validated using RI validation requirements. The evaluation documented in the report and appendix seems to be an appropriate data evaluation for these sites as they are study areas, not RI sites. Therefore, for this FS only, EPA will not require the use of validated data in the study area 01 and 04 risk assessment.

Response—Comment noted. The text of the FS will be modified accordingly.