

N60478.AR.001102
NWS EARLE
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM U S EPA REGION II REGARDING FEASIBILITY STUDY
SITE 13 OPERABLE UNIT 5 (OU5) DECEMBER 2000 NWS EARLE NJ
3/26/2001
U S EPA REGION II

Rec'd 4-2-01

00000783
04.01.00.0017



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION II
290 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007-1866

MAR 26 2001

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

Re: Feasibility Study for Site 13 (OU-5), December, 2000

Dear Mr. Kolicius,

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in accordance with our Federal Facility Agreement with the Navy, has reviewed the above referenced report prepared by Tetra Tech Nus, Inc. Attached are our comments.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (212) 637-3921.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jessica Mollin".

Jessica Mollin, Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Section

cc: G. Goepfert, Naval Weapons Station Earle
B. Marcolina, NJDEP

Comments on Feasibility Study - OU-5

1. As a reminder, EPA has requested that in order to ensure that PCBs did not migrate into the Hockhockson brook, additional sediment samples should be taken between locations 13SD01 and 13SD02. These samples can be taken as confirmatory samples subsequent to the excavation of the PCB "hot spots". This additional sampling should be mentioned in the Remedial Action Alternatives section.

2. Page 1-15, 1.3.2.1, Initial Assessment and Confirmation Study, first paragraph, explain why this site wasn't recommended for a confirmation study.

3. General Comment - throughout the report it is noted that certain groups of contaminants were found to be elevated (i.e., metals) but doesn't state which specific contaminants in the group were elevated (i.e. lead and cadmium). Describe which contaminants were found to be elevated and indicate where in the proposed plan you can find this information.

4. The groundwater contour maps (figures 1-3 and 1-4) contain a wavy green line which is not explained in the legend.

5. There are inconsistencies between the contaminant levels found in the text, tables 1-10 to 1-14 and in Figure 1-5. For example, a manganese level of 58.3 ug/L can be found only in Figure 1-5 (MW13-04) and not in the text or in any of the tables.