

07.01-08/08/94-00367



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION III  
841 Chestnut Building  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Office of Superfund  
Robert Thomson, P.E.  
Mail Code 3HW71

Direct Dial (215) 597-1110  
FAX (215) 597-9890

Date: August 8, 1994

Ms. Brenda Norton, PE  
Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Environmental Quality Division  
Code: 1822  
Building N 26, Room 54  
1510 Gilbert Street  
Norfolk, Va 23511-2699

Re: Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Va.  
Review of draft *Site Management Plan FY 95 and 96*

Dear Ms. Norton:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Navy's draft *Site Management Plan FY 95 and 96* for the Naval Weapons Station-Yorktown NPL site (WPNSTA), and we offer the following comments and concerns:

1. Appendix C, Figure C-8

Based upon EPA's comments on Figure C-10, the Navy may want to re-evaluate the scheduling of the Feasibility Study for Sites 6 and 7.

2. Appendix C, Figure C-10

EPA is uncertain about the ability to conduct a complete treatability study for Sites 6,7,8,9, and 19 within 6 months. The Mycotech proposal to evaluate the feasibility of utilizing white rot fungus to bioremediate explosive-contaminated soils lists a two-year study period. EPA suggests that the Navy plan on conducting these treatability studies for a maximum period of two years, with an evaluation of the status of the treatability studies every six months. If one of the technologies under evaluation proves to be more effective in remediating the explosive-contaminated soils/sediments as a result of the six-month evaluation, then possibly one or two of the five Sites could be selected for utilizing this technology while the complete treatability study continues. Then, the remaining Site(s) could be RODed as the treatability studies are continually-evaluated every six-months.

3. Appendix D, Figure D-3

With respect to Site 8, based upon EPA's comments on Figure C-10, the Navy want to re-visit the scheduling of the Feasibility Study(ies).

4. Appendix D, Figure D-5

Should Figures C-5 and D-5 be re-evaluated/combined/staggered? Which figure governs the actual schedule for Sites 9 and 19?

5. Appendix D, Figure D-8

How does Figure D-8 relate to Figure C-10??

This concludes EPA's comments on the Navy's draft *Site Management Plan FY 95 and 96* for the WPNSTA. If you have any questions concerning EPA's review comments, please feel free to call me at (215) 597-1110,

Sincerely,



Robert Thomson, PE  
VA/WV Superfund Federal Facilities (3HW71)

cc: Stephen Mihalko (VDEQ, Richmond)  
Valerie Walker (WPNSTA, Code 09E37)  
Paul Leonard (USEPA, 3HW71)