N62661.AR.002763
NS NEWPORT
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM U S EPA REGION I ON DRAFT FINAL STUDY AREA SCREENING EVALUATION ADDENDUM ON SHORE DERECKTOR SHIPYARD NS NEWPORT RI
11/15/2012
U S EPA REGION I

EPA 111512

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION I
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100
Boston, MA 02109-3912

November 15, 2012

Mr. Dominic O'Connor
NAVFAC MIDLANT (Code OPNEEV)
Environmental Restoration
Building Z-144, Room 109
9742 Maryland Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23511-3095

Re: Draft Final Study Area Screening Evaluation Addendum, On-Shore Derecktor Shipyard

Dear Mr. O'Connor:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the *Draft Final Study Area Screening Evaluation Addendum* for Operable Unit 5, On-Shore Derecktor Shipyard dated October 2012 (SASE Addendum). The SASE Addendum presents the results of additional sampling and analyses of on shore soil, groundwater, and soil gas, in areas where data gaps were identified, to characterize current conditions following prior removal actions and to update the human health risk assessment. Detailed comments are provided in Attachment A.

I look forward to working with you and the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management toward the cleanup of the Derecktor Shipyard. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (617) 918-1385 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Kymberlee Keckler, Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Superfund Section

Attachment

cc: Pamela Crump, RIDEM, Providence, RI
Darlene Ward, NETC, Newport, RI
Steven Parker, Tetra Tech-NUS, Wilmington, MA

ATTACHMENT A

Page	Comment
p. iv	Please correct the title of Table 5-26. It should refer to Migration from Surface Soil to Groundwater – PCB Removal Area. Tables 5-47, 5-48, and 5-49 are also incorrectly titled.
p. ES-3	Please delete the last two sentences in the executive summary that speculate on the likely alternatives to be selected for the site. Alternatively, the SASE could identify alternatives potentially suitable for inclusion in the FS.
p. 5-55 §5.4.3.12	The last paragraph should include the following statement from the response: "Nonetheless, to ensure protection of human health the vapor intrusion pathway will be considered in future building construction."
p. 6-6, §6.5	Please delete the last two sentences that speculate on the likely alternatives to be selected for the site. Alternatively, the SASE could identify alternatives potentially suitable for inclusion in the FS.