

**Responses to Comments
Draft Site Management Plan
Fiscal Years 2009 through 2013
St. Juliens Creek Annex
Chesapeake, Virginia**

PREPARED FOR: Tim Reisch, NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic
Walt Bell, NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic
John Burchette, EPA Region III
Karen Doran, VDEQ

PREPARED BY: CH2M HILL

DATE: July 14, 2008

Comments from VDEQ, provided 13 June 08.

1. *Comment:* Page 3-2, fourth paragraph – according to this paragraph Site 20 (UXO-01) was given an NFA status in July 2001, it is not clear what the reasoning is for opening it to complete a PA/SI. Please add information to clarify.

Response: The following text has been added for clarification: "...consensus was reached for NFA for Site 20 under CERCLA based on the findings of the human health and ecological risk screenings and the fact that potential risk from buried ordnance would be addressed under the Navy's Range Program.... The Navy's Range Program was never fully implemented, and ordnance sites are now addressed under the MRP. Because site history indicates a potential presence of buried ordnance, in 2008 the wharf areas (northern and southern) were identified as UXO-01 and included under the MRP".

2. *Comment:* Page 3-2, second paragraph, second sentence – change "does not" to "do not."

Response: The change will be made as suggested.

3. *Comment:* Page 3-2, fourth paragraph, third sentence – change "No Navy of" to "No Navy or."

Response: The change will be made as suggested.

Comments from the USEPA, provided 26 June 08.

1. *Comment:* Please remove the 2B and 3B before St. Juliens Creek Annex from the headers.

Response: The change will be made as suggested.

2. **Comment:** *Section 3, Site Descriptions, Page 3-1, 1st Paragraph. The SMP states that 58 IRP sites, SWMU, and AOCs were identified for evaluation. The SMP goes on to say that 4 sites are currently active in the IRP and 55 sites have been considered NFA under the IRP. Please update the text or explain the apparent discrepancy as 55(NFA) +4(active) does not equal 58.*

Response: The text will be corrected to state that 59 IRP sites, SWMUs, and AOCs have been identified for evaluation, 54 sites have been considered NFA under the IRP, and 1 site is currently active in the MRP.

3. **Comment:** *Section 3, Site Descriptions, Page 3-9, 1st full paragraph. Please include a sentence or two that states potential risks identified from the vapor intrusion investigation may lead to addendums to the RI and FS (as was discussed at the partnering meeting).*

Response: The text has been amended to say "Collection of data to further evaluate the vapor intrusion pathway is ongoing. Results of the investigation will be incorporated into an addendum to the RI. If risk is identified based on the vapor intrusion evaluation, it will be incorporated into the FS".