

M00263.AR.000323
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND
5090.3a

EMAIL REGARDING SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL APPROVAL OF U S NAVY RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT FOR SITE 45 MCRD PARRIS ISLAND SC
9/17/2004
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Sladic, Mark

From: David M. Scaturo [SCATURDM@dhec.sc.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:49 AM
To: Leon Fulmer; Sladic, Mark
Cc: Don Hargrove; art.sanford@navy.mil; timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil
Subject: Re: MCRD Parris Island NOTI letter 5/26/04: RI/RFI Site 45

Mark:

The responses look acceptable to me - and yes, we do need a formal hard copy.

Thanks,
David

>>> "Sladic, Mark" <SladicM@ttnus.com> 9/14/2004 11:25:10 AM >>>

Hi everyone - I was reviewing the SCDHEC NOTI letter dated May 26, 2004 for the RI/RFI report for MCRD Parris Island Site 45. This is the letter that I received at our team meeting at MCRD on August 24-25. The letter asks that the outstanding issues following SCDHEC's review of our RTC be further addressed. Please see the following. Upon SCDHEC review and approval of these further responses, I believe we will be able to finalize the 2002 Site 45 RI/RFI Report. Please let me know if SCDHEC will need a formal hard copy response for these issues. thanks.

Engineering Comments

3. Comment Response - This response states that there is no obvious migration of contamination at the site. How does the statement correlate to the most recent groundwater sampling data discussed in team meetings showing that the contaminant plume has moved? FURTHER RESPONSE: The original response was to add the following sentence to the report: 'Based on approximately 5 years of monitoring data, there is no obvious migration of groundwater contamination.' Per SCDHEC's recent comment, the sentence will be revised to the following: 'Based on five years of monitoring data from 1996 through 2001, there was no obvious migration of groundwater contamination, however, sampling at one location in early 2003 did indicate that some downgradient migration had occurred. The Navy has since provided funding for additional field activities that will update the the plume maps in a future report.'

4. Comment Response - This response references EPA SSL Guidance, which recommends a DAF of 20. Given site-specific information provided in Appendix E, page E-11, the DAF at Site/SWMU 45 is approximately equal to 1. Please revise the document accordingly. FURTHER RESPONSE: The RI/RFI will be revised utilizing a DAF of 1.

5. Comment Response - This response states that metals, pesticides, and PCBs were not present at the site and therefore were not evaluated. Could the volatile organic compounds released at the site have potentially mobilized metals in soils? If this scenario is possible, it is recommended that metals be included in the evaluation. FURTHER RESPONSE: Typically, a significant change in groundwater pH would be required to mobilize metals. No significant pH changes have been noted in site groundwater. No change to the RI/RFI Report is required.

7. Comment Response - Please see the discussion for comment number 4 and the DAF calculations. FURTHER RESPONSE: The RI/RFI will be revised utilizing a DAF of 1.

Mark Sladic, P.E.
Project Manager

9/29/2004