



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 1

JOHN F. KENNEDY FEDERAL BUILDING
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02203-0001

722
N00101.AR.000224
NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH
5090.3a

December 1, 1997

Mr. Steve Hurff
Northern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Hwy., Mail Stop #82
Lester, PA 19113-2090

Subject: Review of Draft Revision 1: Environmental Baseline Survey Phase II Errata for
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Hurff:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has completed its review of the Draft Revision 1: Environmental Baseline Survey Phase II Errata for Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts.

The Navy's Errata is thorough and, with the exception of some comments noted in Attachment I, this document addresses EPA's concerns satisfactorily. EPA's comments on this document are provided in Attachment I to this letter.

Thank you for your continued cooperation on this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at (617) 223-5582.

Sincerely,

Patty Marajh-Whittemore
Remedial Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Tom Papoulias/ Dave Barney/ NAS SOWEY
Lane McDonough/ Leslie Gerstenfeld/ Stone & Webster
Albe Simenas/ MADEP
Tim Prior/ U.S. Fish & Wildlife
Jayne Michaud/ Steve DiMattei/ EPA
Rayo Bhungara/ Peter Golonka/ Gannett Fleming

00791

ATTACHMENT 1

EBS Review Item-Specific Comments

1. Page 2, paragraph 4: Why was Review Item 93 changed from Sampling Level 2 to Sampling Level 1? Please clarify.
2. Page 12, paragraph 3: Please revise the text to indicate that an updated Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Plan is scheduled for release in Spring 1998.
3. Page 15: Please include the Phase II review item number of each of the 15 distinct locations where three or more "significant spill responses were recorded. This with assist in reviewing the items.
4. Page 32, paragraph 3: In sentence # 1, please delete the term "basewide" and replace with "[was conducted] at selected locations near the IR sites."
5. Page 38, Section 6.2.2.1: The EPA does not agree with the conclusion that Review Item No. 99 is a Sampling Level 1 or No Further Action. The 1948 Memo from the Navy Department, Bureau of Aeronautics - states that radium was not used at the installation prior to 1948. The Navy should cite the documentation in the Errata and should provide additional supporting information clarifying whether radium was used after 1948 or whether relevant activities occurred at the base (e.g., maintaining instrument panels) which would have required radium. Further documentation is needed; therefore, Review Item No. 99 should be changed to a sampling level 2.
6. Page 43, Section 6.2.2.18. Does the Navy propose to sample for soil contaminants (TPH, sVOCs) as a measure for the integrity of the separator?
7. Page 50, section 6.4.2.29 - Mass 6 Site: Review Item No. 98, the EPA does not agree with Sampling Level 1 - No further Action for this item. This item should be changed to a Sampling Level 2 to determine if PCBs are present in subsurface soil (only surface soil samples were reported and spilled PCB-containing material could contaminate subsurface soil. Also, what was the material and structure of the transformer pad?