

**RESPONSES TO NOAA COMMENTS DATED 19 AUGUST 2003 ON THE  
QAPP FOR ADDITIONAL SEDIMENT SAMPLING AND CHARACTERIZATION FOR  
PHASE II REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION IR PROGRAM SITE 16 OF AUGUST 2003  
NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER DAVISVILLE  
NORTH KINGSTOWN, RHODE ISLAND**

**Comment 1:** NOAA reviewed a Draft Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA) for this operable unit in October 2001. That SLERA indicated potential risk. However, this new document states that the Navy will perform a new(?) SLERA. Although NOAA understands the need for further study before a Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment takes place, calling this a SLERA implies fault with the original SLERA. Rather, NOAA suggests calling the future SLERA a revised SLERA or a Phase 2 SLERA.

**Response—** The revised SLERA will be called a Phase 2 SLERA.

**Comment 2:** The Navy should include in this document and certainly the (revised?) SLERA, the high organic (and some inorganic) concentrations in the adjacent Allen Harbor sediments. And as stated in 2001, NOAA would like to examine the actual 2001 sediment and seep chemical concentrations. Tables 4 and 5 from the SLERA only provide the location for those samples showing the maximum concentration; values for the maximum and minimum are provided but the location of the minimum is not. The concentration and location of the middle sample is a mystery.

**Response—** The results for the three sediment samples collected for the Phase I RI will be added to the new data collected as a result of this sampling effort. All of these data (old and new) will be provided in the Phase 2 SLERA.

**Comment 3:** And as stated in 2001, the high concentrations of organic (and some inorganic) contaminants found in the sediment are not surprising given the previous Spink Neck data from 1993. It was observed from the Allen Harbor Phase 2 Risk Assessment Pilot Study that significant mortality of *Ampelisca* was observed with sediment from the Spink Neck outfall. The Navy should include this data in subsequent reports allowing for some discussion on sediment concentration trends.

**Response—** The location of the 1993 sample that showed high concentrations of contaminants is located in the same approximate location for a new sample to be collected as a part of this study (See Figure 8-1, sample labeled as "outfall"). These new data will be much more reflective of current conditions found in this area; therefore, use of the 1993 data is not planned in the SLERA.