

Capito, Bonnie P CIV NAVFAC Lant

From: Cole, Linda L CIV NAVFAC MidAtlantic
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 7:29 AM
To: Capito, Bonnie P CIV NAVFAC Lant
Subject: ARF - FW: CAX - Draft Technical Memorandum Pre-Removal Characterization of Sediments
Attachments: Summary of Comments on Microsoft Word - fly sheets.pdf; Draft Site 1 Pre-Removal Tech Memo.fdf

VDEQ comments to CAX Site 1 document.

-----Original Message-----

From: Miller, Debra [mailto:damiller@deq.virginia.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 17:06
To: Marlene Ivester; Cole, Linda L CIV NAVFAC MidAtlantic; Don Joiner; Greyson Franklin (Franklin. Greyson (E-mail))
Subject: CAX - Draft Technical Memorandum Pre-Removal Characterization of Sediments

Hi, all.

The VDEQ has completed its review of the subject document. Our comments are attached (in Adobe .fdf format to import into the .pdf file). Additionally, I have included a comment summary. Please let me know if there are any questions or concerns. Have a good week all!

*Debra A. Miller
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Restoration Program
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Email: damiller@deq.virginia.gov
Phone: 804-698-4206
Fax: 804-698-4234
DEQ Website: www.deq.state.va.us*

"You only need two tools; WD40 and Duct Tape. If it doesn't move and should, use WD40. If it does move and shouldn't, use duct tape." - Email Joke

5/3/2006

Summary of Comments on Microsoft Word - fly sheets.doc

Page: 1

Author: damiller

Subject: Note

Date: 5/1/2006 4:57:02 PM

 Quick explanation of my comments:

Any note in BLUE is for my information, a change to the document is not necessary.

Any note in YELLOW is for further explanation/changes, as required.

Other edits will be made using the text edit tools.

Page: 9

Author: damiller

Subject: Note

Date: 5/1/2006 4:57:41 PM

 Section 2.1

As an incinerator ash landfill, it seems that ash would be a main component of this landfill. Why is ash not listed as part of the contents? Was ash not exposed?

Page: 10

Author: damiller
Subject: Cross-Out
Date: 5/1/2006 4:58:01 PM
 Section 2.3 Edit

Author: damiller
Subject: Note
Date: 5/1/2006 4:58:30 PM
 Page 2-2, Section 2.3
What was the acreage of the disturbed wetlands?

Author: damiller
Subject: Highlight
Date: 5/1/2006 4:58:49 PM
Page 2-3, Section 2.4

T For my information, was this a human health based cleanup goal? Was the current PCB action-level for fish tissue (filet) of 50 ppb discussed with the selection of this PRG?

Author: damiller

Subject: Note

Date: 5/1/2006 4:59:22 PM

 General Comment on PCBs

The VDEQ currently has a new PCB strategy that requires congener analysis for sites with PCBs and an aquatic pathway. Will this strategy be incorporated in future evaluation of this site? For more information, please see <http://www.deq.virginia.gov/fishtissue/pcbstrategy.html>

Page: 24

Author: damiller

Subject: Note

Date: 5/1/2006 4:59:47 PM

Page 4-8, Section 4.1.13

Why is no removal required for the "yellow" areas that are above the established cleanup goals? This does not make sense, if you are not going to cleanup to your established goals, then maybe the goals need to be changed to what you actually plan on doing. Please clarify or provide further justification as to why exceedances less than 2 times the cleanup goal will not be removed.

Author: damiller
Subject: Note
Date: 5/1/2006 5:00:01 PM

 Table 2-1

The values for sediments are different then the PRGs provided in the 20 April 2006 email to the eco sub-group? What goals are to be used?

Author: damiller
Subject: Note
Date: 5/1/2006 5:00:11 PM

 Table 4-3

Please check as there are no PAH results for samples CX01SD97-00 or CX01SD98-00.

Author: damiller

Subject: Note

Date: 5/1/2006 5:00:20 PM

Table 4-3

Please check - no PAH results for CX01SD104-00.

Author: damiller
Subject: Note
Date: 5/1/2006 5:00:36 PM

 Figure 2-2
The legend for the landfill removal is not on the figure (pink cross-hatch). Is the landfill removal within the pink line on the figure?
