



State of New Jersey

Christine Todd Whitman
Governor

Department of Environmental Protection

Robert C. Shinn, Jr.
Commissioner

AUG 20 1996

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
NO. P 170 079 731

John Kolicius
Project Manager
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway
Code 1821, Mail Stop 82
Lester, PA 19113-2090

Dear Mr. Kolicius:

Re: Revised Remedial Investigation (RI) Report
Naval Weapons Station Earle
Colts Neck Twp., Monmouth Co.

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) has reviewed the above referenced document prepared by Brown and Root Environmental., dated July 1996. The NJDEP approves this report with the following modifications. After Department review, these modifications can be addressed as additional/revised pages and inserted in the revised July 1996 RI Report. No additional versions of the RI report are necessary.

- 1) **General:** Any site that has a "no further action" recommendation, where there are still ground water contaminants above the NJDEP's Ground Water Quality Standards, should be amended to "natural attenuation" or "natural remediation" which would include the implementation of a Classification Exception Area (CEA).
- 1) **Section 2.5 -** Appropriate narrative should be added to this section of the document discussing the observed discrepancy between the CLP contract detection limits (CDLs) and the ARARs and TBCs section of the site-specific sections. At issue is the fact that the CLP detection limit deliverables appear to be 10 ppb (organics), yet the ground water quality standards and the Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) are less ranging from 1 to 5 ppb respectively. The footnotes to the data tables indicate that the values were not detected, [i.e., a "U" qualifier]. This discrepancy in values could present some confusion to future readers of this report. The proposed narrative should simply state that the "U" qualifier on the

10 ppb means that no contamination was found above the CLP detection limit, in essence a non-detect value.

- 2) Section 7.0 - In the recommendations subsection, Brown & Root reference an EPA publication as a recommended remedial alternative action for this site. Although the recommendation may be an appropriate one, no detail is given. The document or recommendation should be described in further detail.
- 3) Section 23 - In the recommendations subsection, the ground water contamination should be addressed in addition to the soil contamination.
- 4) Section 31 - The analytical data generated from the ground water samples should be tabulated and presented in this section of the report. The actual support data for background well number one through four should be presented in the format discussed immediately above.

Brown & Root should evaluate this data with respect to trends in inorganic data for the different outcrops and the respective background and/or monitor wells located in that respective outcrop, tables #31-4, 31-5 and 31-6 show the tabulated data needed to start this evaluation. These trends should then be compared to ground water data generated from the background/upgradient monitor wells from the various sites located in the respective outcrop region. All conclusions should be presented in this section of the document.

If you have any questions, please call me at (609)-633-7237.

Sincerely,



Bob Marcolina, Case Manager
Bureau of Federal Case Management

c: J. Gratz, EPA
G. Geopfert, NWS Earle
L. Jargowsky, Monmouth Co. Health Dept.