



## Comments

1. Section 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – It is stated that Site 35 was addressed during a previous phase of the project and does not warrant further investigation. What previous phase is this referring to and who made the determination of no further investigation?
2. Section 1.2 – The Site 35 discussion should explain that this area has been identified as a RCRA SWMU. The sentence could read, (if true): “The remediation activity for this area along with the no further action determination was completed under the RCRA program with State approval. Therefore, Site 35 has been removed from OU 6.” [NOTE: This could be the explanation for comment 1.]
3. Section 5, Nature and Extent of Contamination, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph – add to the end of the last sentence “and is summarized in Section 5.???” (new section) or the information from the SRI can be included within 5.2 in the respective section.
4. Page 6-11 – This section discusses the soil to gw pathway and documents low level detections in soil and subsurface soils, but does not identify detections in gw. However, Section 9 identifies SVOCs, naphthalene and 2-methylnaphthalene as being in the soil and also in the gw. This is an inconsistency within the document and can be corrected by highlighting that the SRI identified detects in the gw that can be attributed to the soil contaminant concentrations.
5. Section 6.3 – Should identify that there is SVOCs soil to gw migration as documented in the SRI.
6. Section 7.1, HHRA, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, first sentence – add to the end of the sentence “and is not included in Section 7 of this report.”.