

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

1021 NORTH GRAND AVENUE EAST, P.O. BOX 19276, SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62794-9276 - (217) 782-3397
JAMES R. THOMPSON CENTER, 100 WEST RANDOLPH, SUITE 11-300, CHICAGO, IL 60601 - (312) 814-6026

ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, GOVERNOR

DOUGLAS P. SCOTT, DIRECTOR

(217) 557-8155
(FAX) 782-3258

September 30, 2005

Commander, Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Attn: Mr. Anthony Robinson
2155 Eagle Drive
North Charleston, South Carolina 29406

Re: Responses to Illinois EPA Comments on the
Draft Feasibility Study Report Site 22 - Building 105
Old Dry Cleaning Facility, Naval Station Great Lakes
Great Lakes, Illinois

0971255048 - Lake
Great Lakes Naval Station
Superfund/Technical

Dear Mr. Robinson:

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Illinois EPA or Agency) is in receipt of the Navy's responses to Illinois EPA's comments on the Draft Feasibility Study Report, Site 22 - Building 105, Old Dry Cleaning Facility from Tetra Tech NUS, Inc. They were dated September 6, 2005 and received at Illinois EPA via electronic mail on September 20, 2005. The Agency has reviewed the Navy's responses and the additional submitted information. The majority of the responses are considered acceptable. There are a few that require additional comment. They are provided below.

- 1) **Response to Comment Number 1** - The Navy's response and the referenced e-mail from USEPA are both based on the source of the contamination being unknown. USEPA's interpretation of the contained-in policy in the April 29, 1996 Federal Register (61 FR pages 18792, 18805) states that it is the owner/operator's responsibility to make a good faith effort to determine whether hazardous constituents in media originated from (listed) hazardous waste. If the origin of the constituents cannot be determined, then the media would not be considered to contain a listed hazardous waste. Furthermore, if the media does not exhibit a hazardous characteristic, then it would not be subject to the RCRA regulations.

In the case of the contaminated soils and groundwater under Building 105, it is Illinois EPA's opinion that the generator was in error when they made their determination of whether the hazardous constituents in the soil and groundwater under the building originated from listed hazardous waste. However, since the referenced e-mail was issued and the demolition work completed prior to initiation of the Remedial Investigation performed at this site, that previous determination will not be addressed further.

For the current remedial efforts, though, the origin of the hazardous constituents is no longer an unknown. As noted in Illinois EPA's previous comment number 16, the process that generated the waste is clearly identified as a dry cleaning operation that used tetrachloroethylene (PCE) -

ROCKFORD - 4302 North Main Street, Rockford, IL 61103 - (815) 987-7760 • DES PLAINES - 9511 W. Harrison St., Des Plaines, IL 60016 - (847) 294-4000
ELGIN - 595 South State, Elgin, IL 60123 - (847) 608-3131 • PEORIA - 5415 N. University St., Peoria, IL 61614 - (309) 693-5463
BUREAU OF LAND - PEORIA - 7620 N. University St., Peoria, IL 61614 - (309) 693-5462 • CHAMPAIGN - 2125 South First Street, Champaign, IL 61820 - (217) 278-5800
SPRINGFIELD - 4500 S. Sixth Street Rd., Springfield, IL 62706 - (217) 786-6892 • COLLINSVILLE - 2009 Mall Street, Collinsville, IL 62234 - (618) 346-5120
MARION - 2309 W. Main St., Suite 116, Marion, IL 62959 - (618) 993-7200

a listed hazardous waste (F002) when disposed. When one looks at the provided information, the location of the dry cleaner in the building, the floor drains located beneath the washing machines, the grease trap that those floor drains fed into, and the location of the highest concentrations of contaminants; the source is no longer questionable. Any reasonable person would conclude that the dry cleaner via the floor drains and the grease trap were the primary source. According to the Feasibility Study (FS) itself, following the third bullet in Section 1.3.1, "*The primary source of soil and groundwater contamination appears to be the former drains and grease catch basin in the southeastern portion of the building.*" In addition, the process that generated this hazardous waste was in operation until the early 1990s – long after the effective date of RCRA and the definitions of hazardous waste.

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the media (soil and groundwater) under Building 105 contaminated with dry cleaning solvents should be identified as a listed hazardous waste for PCE (F002 and/or U210). It may also be a characteristic hazardous waste due to the PCE (D039) and other TCLP parameters such as 1,1-DCE (D029) as well.

This site is being remediated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) regulations and must therefore comply with requirements that are either applicable or relevant and appropriate (ARAR). If contaminated soil at the site either contains a listed waste or exhibits a characteristic of a hazardous waste, the requirements for the management of hazardous waste under RCRA would be relevant and appropriate, and once managed (excavated) applicable.

The contaminated soil under Building 412 and 912 that remains at these sites would not have been identified as hazardous waste because the remediation work was done under RCRA using Illinois EPA's Tiered Approach to Corrective Action Objectives (TACO) regulations, not CERCLA, and it was not generated (excavated).

- 2) **Response to Comment Number 2** – Collecting additional soil samples to determine the extent of contamination that would fail TCLP analysis is feasible and should be performed, if the chosen alternative will be excavating contaminated soil and treating or disposing of it.
- 3) **Response to Comment Number 5** – Responses 5a and 5c should be acceptable provided comment number one can be resolved. The revisions will need to be consistent with the resolution of that comment.
- 4) **Response to Comment Number 9** – The response makes a reasonable argument. However, if the evaluated alternatives will be relying on the already existing controls and restrictions to eliminate that pathway, then those restrictions must also be part of the alternatives. In that way, even if the Navy were to change their policy regarding the use of groundwater on base sometime in the future, the restrictions would still apply to this site and would still be enforceable. Please revise the alternatives in the FS that rely on those restrictions to include them as part of the alternative.
- 5) **Response to Comment Number 10** – See response to comment number 1. The RAOs need to be revised to address this issue.

- 6) **Response to Comment Number 15** – Response acceptable provided the controls and/or restrictions are included as part of the alternatives, as discussed in comment number 4 above.
- 7) **Response to Comment Number 16** – See comment number 1 above.
- 8) **Response to Comment Number 25** – See comment number 6 above.
- 9) **Response to Comment Number 29** – The second paragraph of the response states that no land use controls were included for the alternatives developed for this FS. As noted above, in order to eliminate the groundwater ingestion pathway, certain land use controls are required to be part of the alternative and must be enforceable.

The outline for Alternative 5 is helpful, but a full review cannot be performed without the complete description and evaluation. Illinois EPA will have to review that alternative upon receipt of the revised FS. One thing to note, though, is that if the new alternative will be leaving PCE and TCE contaminated soil and groundwater on site, the groundwater to indoor air pathway must be re-evaluated post-remediation and the risks re-calculated or else the site will need to remain a parking lot in perpetuity. To ensure such a restriction is enforced, a land use control will be required.

- 10) **Response to Comment Number 38** – See comment number 9 above.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (217) 557-8155 or by electronic mail at brian.conrath@epa.state.il.us.

Sincerely,



Brian A. Conrath
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Unit
Federal Site Remediation Section
Bureau of Land

BAC:  \\frac:HGLN\NTC\Site 22 related\site22FSR\Crvw

cc: Bob Davis, Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.
Mark Shultz, US Navy - EFA Midwest
Owen Thompson, USEPA (SR-6J)