



State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
Department of Environmental Management
Office of Waste Management
235 Promenade Street
Providence, RI 02908

16 May 1997

Mr. Philip Otis, P.E., Remedial Project Manager
US Department of the Navy, Northern Division
Code 18, Mail Stop #82
10 Industrial Highway
Lester, PA 19113-2090

RE: Draft Record of Decision
Site 09, Allen Harbor Landfill
NCBC Davisville, Rhode Island
Submitted 28 January 1997, Dated 27 January 1997

Dear Mr. Otis;

The Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (RIDEM) Office of Waste Management has reviewed the above referenced document and comments are attached. Comments were originally due in February, however, at the request of the public the comment period was extended twice to 15 May 1997. RIDEM elected to wait until the close of the comment period so that it could review and take into consideration the public's comments. As a result of this review RIDEM has three major areas of concern:

1. The Navy has indicated that the landfill cover will meet the substantive requirements of federal and state laws consisting of multiple soil layers and two impermeable layers. To avoid any confusion and better inform the public of the proposed remedial action the Navy must state specifically, in the ROD, what the soil layers and impermeable layers will consist of.
2. Based on the potential for future releases to the environment and to alleviate the public's concern for groundwater contamination, as evidenced by the letters received during the public comment period, performance standards need to be developed which would clearly define under what circumstances groundwater containment would be required.
3. And finally, the final design must allow for this land to be used for conservation and recreational purposes as outlined in the Comprehensive Base Reuse Plan and further emphasized by the Town of North Kingstown (future property owner) in their 20 February 1997 letter to you on the proposed plan for this site. RIDEM shares the town's desire for conservation and recreational use of this site.

RIDEM looks forward to working with the Navy and EPA to finalizing this Record of Decision. If you have any questions or require additional information please call me at (401) 277-3872 ext. 7138.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard Gottlieb", written over a faint circular stamp or watermark.

Richard Gottlieb, P.E.
Principal Sanitary Engineer

Attachment:

cc: T. Gray, Chief, DEM OWM
W. Angell, DEM OWM
C. Williams, EPA Region 1
H. Cohen, RIEDC
M. Cohen, ToNK
W. Davis, CSO NCBC

ROD9.RWG/SHARED

Comments For:

**Draft Record of Decision
Site 09 - Allen Harbor Landfill
Naval Construction Battalion Center
Davisville, Rhode Island**

Submitted 28 January 1997, Dated 27 January 1997

1. **Page 1 of 2, Description of the Selected remedial Action;
Bullet 2.**

This bullet states that the landfill cover will meet the substantive requirements of federal and state laws consisting of multiple soil layers and two impermeable layers. Please note that the Navy must state specifically, in the ROD, what the soil layers and impermeable layers will consist of.

2. **Page 3, Section III, Community Participation;
Paragraph 1, Sentence 2.**

In addition to the RAB, also mention the TRC which preceded the RAB.

3. **Page 4, Section IV, Scope and Role of Response Action;
Paragraph 2, Sentence 3.**

Please note that the multi-media cap will be built according to the standards noted in comment 1.

4. **Page 6, Section V, Summary of Site Characteristics;
Paragraphs 4 & 5.**

As stated in RIDEM's 11 December 1996 and 27 February 1997 comments on the Consolidated Response to EPA/RIDEM Comment on RI/FS/PP for this site additional infra-red information would be needed at different times of the year to fully understand groundwater discharge to Allen Harbor. In addition EPA questioned the methodology of the statistical analysis and questions regarding salinity and capillary action have not been answered to date. These paragraphs should be modified to reflect the above information otherwise those sentences referring to these studies should be removed.

5. **Page 10, Section VI, Summary of Site Risks (Marine Ecological Risk Assessment);
Paragraph 2, Sentence 2.**

Please write out what "EEZ" stands for.

6. **Page 17, Section IX, Summary of the Comparative Analysis of Alternatives;
Threshold Criteria (Overall Protection of Human health and the Environment);**

Paragraph 1, Sentence 3.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would protect human health and the environment through containing landfill constituents and affected soil, minimizing site erosion, controlling overland runoff, preventing direct contact of humans and terrestrial animals with fill materials or affected soil, removing or covering landfill debris along the site shoreline, restricting future site development and ground-water use, improving natural resources by creating shoreline wetlands as feasible, and providing long-term monitoring and maintenance of remedial components.

Please add that new signage prohibiting shellfishing in the harbor would be added. In addition, it should be noted that Alternative 2 (Soil Cap) would allow significant infiltration into the fill media which in turn would allow the continued production of leachate thereby not containing all the landfill constituents.

7. **Page 18, Section IX, Summary of the Comparative Analysis of Alternatives; Threshold Criteria (Overall Protection of Human health and the Environment); Paragraph 2, Last Sentence.**

It should be noted in this sentence that because alternative 2 will not substantially reduce infiltration leachate will still be produced which can affect marine receptors.

8. **Page 18, Section IX, Summary of the Comparative Analysis of Alternatives; Threshold Criteria (Compliance with ARARs); Paragraph 1, Sentence 2.**

Alternative 2 may meet the substantive requirements of federal and state ARARs.

Please revise this sentence to state that Alternative 2 does not meet the substantive requirements of federal and state ARARs.

9. **Page 20, Section IX, Summary of the Comparative Analysis of Alternatives; Primary Balancing Criteria (Implementability); Paragraph 1, Sentence 2.**

Please remove Alternative 2 from this sentence or note that it would not meet ARARs.

10. **Page 20, Section IX, Summary of the Comparative Analysis of Alternatives; Primary Balancing Criteria (Implementability); Paragraph 2.**

Within this paragraph please note that every effort will be made to manifold the gas vents to reduce the area that would need to be fenced.

11. **Page 21, Section X, Selected Remedy; Bullet 1.**

Please note that a waiver from RIDEM's Solid Waste regulations would be required to allow for a 2:1 slope. The regulations currently allow for a maximum of 3:1 slope.

**12. Pag 21, Section X, Selected Remedy;
Bullet 3.**

Within this paragraph please note that every effort will be made to manifold the gas vents to reduce the area that would need to be fenced.

13. Figure 6, Risk Assessment Pilot Study Sample Locations.

Please place a legend on this figure which explains the difference between the black circles and the cross-hatched areas.

14. General Comment.

Based on the potential for future releases to the environment and to alleviate the public's concern for groundwater contamination, as evidenced by the letters received during the public comment period, performance standards need to be developed which would clearly define under what circumstances groundwater containment would be required.