



RHODE ISLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

235 Promenade Street, Providence, RI 02908-5767

TDD 401-831-5508

31 March 1999

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: Site 09 ESD  
Fact Sheet 14  
Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Davisville, Rhode Island  
Submitted 31 March 1999, Dated March 1999

Dear Mr. Otis;

The Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, Office of Waste Management (RIDEM) has reviewed the above referenced document and comments are attached.

If you have any questions or require additional information please call me at (401) 222-2797 ext.7138.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard Gottlieb".

Richard Gottlieb, P.E.  
Principal Engineer

Attachment:

cc: W. Angell, OWM DEM  
C. Williams, EPA Region 1  
H. Cohen, RIEDC  
S. Licardi, ToNK  
W. Davis, CSO NCBC  
J. Shultz, EA Eng.

LETTER1.RWGRICHG

FIG 101

1/2/99

DATE: 03/31/99

TIME: 10:00 AM

10:00 AM

10:00 AM

10:00 AM

RIDEM Comments For:

**Draft Explanation of Significant Difference  
for the Record of Decision for  
Installation Restoration Program Site 09  
Allen Harbor Landfill  
Fact Sheet 14  
Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Davisville, Rhode Island**

Submitted 31 March 1999, Dated March 1999

**1. Page 2, Column 2, Paragraph 3.**

Place a sentence after the first sentence to state that by the early 1990's this cap was discontinuous as landfill waste could be seen on the surface.

**2. Page 4, Column 1, Support Agency Comments;  
Paragraph 1, Last Sentence.**

*RIDEM's letter of concurrence on the ESD was signed on ..... and sent out on.....*

Please revise this to:

*RIDEM's letter of concurrence on the ESD was signed on.....*

**3. Page 5, Column 1, For More Information.**

Please include the e-mail address for Mr. Richard Gottlieb

rgottlie@doa.state.ri.us

**4. General Comment.**

It would be helpful if the public understood how the Navy made the decision to proceed with alternative 4. Therefore, please provide some discussion as to how this alternative was selected over the other alternatives (cost, maintenance issues, etc.). A one paragraph explanation should be sufficient.