

N00164.AR.002381  
NSA CRANE  
5090.3a

TRANSMITTAL LETTER REGARDING DRAFT FINAL RCRA FACILITY INVESTIGATION  
REPORT AND FINAL RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FOR ILLUMINANT BUILDING 126 SOLID  
WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT 27 (SWMU 27) NSA CRANE IN

8/28/2012  
TETRA TECH



PITT-08-12-056

August 28, 2012

Project No. 112G02126

Mr. Howard Hickey  
NAVFAC MW  
201 Decatur Avenue  
Building 1A, Code EV  
Great Lakes, Illinois 60088

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62470-08-D-1001  
Contract Task Order No. F276

Subject: Draft Final Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation (RFI) Report and Final Response to Comments (RTC) for NSA Crane Illuminant Building 126 (SWMU 27)

Dear Mr. Hickey:

Attached you will find the Final RTC for the Navy comments on the Draft RFI Report for Illuminant Building 126 (SWMU 27). All Navy comments have been addressed. The Draft Final SWMU 27 RFI Report is enclosed. The appendices are included on the CD.

Please contact me at (412) 921-8308 (email: [Ralph.Basinski@tetrattech.com](mailto:Ralph.Basinski@tetrattech.com)) or John Ducar at (412) 921-8089 (email: [John.Ducar@tetrattech.com](mailto:John.Ducar@tetrattech.com)) regarding any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Ralph Basinski  
Project Manager

RRB/mlg  
Enclosure

- cc: Mr. Tom Brent, NSA Crane (letter, attachment, 4 hard copy enclosures and CDs)
- Mr. Ralph Basinski, Tetra Tech, Inc. (letter, attachment, hard copy enclosure and CD)
- Mr. John Ducar, Tetra Tech, Inc. (letter, attachment, hard copy enclosure and CD)
- Project File – CTO F276 (letter, attachment, hard copy enclosure and CD)

## RESPONSES TO NAVY COMMENTS RECEIVED APRIL 17, 2012

### SWMU 27 DRAFT RFI REPORT

#### NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY CRANE, CRANE, INDIANA

**Comment 1: p.5-6 §5.2.3: Please add a figure of results (tag map) for the pits and sumps.**

Response: Figure 5-4 has been added to the report, which provides the analytical data for the sump/pit samples. The data tags show those compounds which exceed the human health and/or ecological risk criteria.

**Comment 2: p.7-4 Background Evaluation: Please clarify that the Crane Basewide Background report was used for evaluation of background concentrations. Also, consider adding a table showing the concentrations of metals in the associated background depositional environment.**

Response: The Crane Basewide Background report was used for evaluation of background concentrations. Section 5.1 discusses the Basewide soil background data, and Section 5.1.1 describes the soil depositional environments used for comparison of SWMU 27 soil data. The background concentrations are presented in Tables 5-1 through 5-5.

The following text has been added to the "Background Evaluation" subsection of Section 7.1.1: "Discussion of the NSA Crane Basewide Background report is presented in Section 5.1."

**Comment 3: p.7-5 1<sup>st</sup> ¶: ". . . in the risk characterization section in Section 7.4.34.4."**

Response: The subject sentence on page 7-5 has been revised to read "However, chemicals present at concentrations exceeding risk-based screening criteria, but not selected as COPCs on the basis of background evaluations are further discussed in the risk characterization section in Section 7.4.3.4."

**Comment 4: p.7-8 1<sup>st</sup> Bullet and Table 7-2: Table 7-2 uses the maximum concentration of lead from a pit sample (see p.4/4 of Table 5-5). However, the maximum concentration of manganese is from a soil sample, not a pit sample. Since the pits had much higher concentrations of manganese, this appears to be inconsistent.**

Response: The maximum concentration of lead presented in Table 7-2 inadvertently included the results of sample 27SS066C0002, which was collected from inside a sump/pit. The pit samples were not intended to be included in the risk evaluations. However, based on Navy comments, the Human Health Risk Assessment (Section 7.0, including Table 7-2) has been revised to include the pit samples for evaluating risks to the construction worker.

**Comment 5: p.7-12 Construction Workers and Table 7-11, et al: Please include the pits when evaluating risks to the construction worker.**

Response: The Human Health Risk Assessment (Section 7.0) has been revised to include the pit samples for evaluating risks to the construction worker.

**Comment 6: p.7-34 §7.6: The summary and conclusions needs to clearly state that NFA is recommended.**

Response: A summary and conclusion section has been added as Section 9.0.