



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
CRANE DIVISION
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER
300 HIGHWAY 361
CRANE, INDIANA 47522-5001

5090 IN REPLY REFER TO
Ser 095/6062
8 MAR 1996

From: Commander, Crane Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center
To: Commander, Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment
Station

Subj: COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT INTERIM COMPOSTING REPORT

Encl: (1) Comments on the Draft Interim Composting Report

1. Crane Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center (NAVSURFWARCENDIV Crane) provides comments on the subject report as enclosure (1). The report has been forwarded to the U.S. EPA for review and comment. Please provide a written response to the comments and incorporate necessary changes into the final report.

2. NAVSURFWARCENDIV Crane point of contact is Mr. Thomas J. Brent, Code 09510, telephone 812-854-6160.

G. K. Hill

G. K. Hill
2000-0000

Copy to:
SOUTHNAVFACENCOM (CODE 1864)
COMNAVSEASYSOM (SEA 07E)
USEPA (HRP-8J)
MK (Steve Downey)
ROICC (Brent Robertson)
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT INTERIM COMPOSTING REPORT

GENERAL: Correct grammar throughout the report, such as verb-tense agreements (e.g., p.2, "In addition, respirometry help to identify . . .," or p.3, "If any of these three conditions are not satisfied, then the mix had to be appropriately adjusted.").

GENERAL: Correct punctuation throughout the report, such as 2 spaces after a ":" (e.g., p.6, "Table 3:Contaminated Soil" should be "Table 3: Contaminated Soil").

1. p.2 Last ¶

How was the 40%-40%-20% mix determined.

2. p.6 and Table 2

"Mix 1 had an initial moisture content of 35.11% and mix 4 of 82.27%" This should be mixes 1 and 5.

3. p.6 and Table 3

a. "The initial pH and moisture content values all fall within the tolerance for pH of 5-8 and moisture content of 40-60%." Treatment #1 had a pH of 8.23. Treatment #2 had a moisture content of 61.48%, #6 was 63.81% and #7 was 63.85%. Please clarify.

b. "In this study, the TVS remained constant or a reduction occurred." While some of the treatments did show a reduction, it appears that none of the treatments "remained constant," but rather, increased, except for #1 for which the final data was not reported. Is this perhaps "constant" relative to the increases exhibited by the uncontaminated batches? Please clarify.

4. p.7 and Table 6

Include an explanation of what the estimated change in concentration of the explosives should be just due to the mixing. One would expect the concentration to decrease by roughly $\frac{1}{5}$ (depending on the densities of the amendments and soils). As such, clarify whether the reported initial average concentration is before or after mixing.

5. pp.7-8 Conclusion

Since mixes 1 and 5 also did well in the respirometric study (ranked 3rd and 4th, respectively), why were these mixes not included in the bench scale testing? This seems like it would have been prudent, especially since; a.) both turkey manure and POTW sludge are readily available to the site, and b.) #4 never made it into the reactor.

6. p.10 ¶3

Again, explosives concentrations of the raw soil (prior to mixing with the amendments) would be helpful in interpreting the data.

7. p.11 ¶3

Typographical error: "... appeared to result from nitrogen uptake ..."

8. p.12 and Figure 5

Note that the legend for the figure shows the "core" symbol as shaded gray, while the chart has the core profile as black. Please correct for clarity.