

N00164.AR.002581
NSA CRANE
5090.3a

EMAIL AND RESPONSE TO U S EPA COMMENTS ON INTERIM MEASURES REPORT
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT 12 (SWMU 12) BATTERY DISPOSAL SITE NSA CRANE
IN
3/3/2015
U S NAVY

Cohen, Deborah

From: Brent, Thomas CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, PWD Crane <thomas.brent@navy.mil>
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2015 6:14 AM
To: 'Ramanauskas, Peter'
Cc: Cole, Linda L CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, IPTNE; Cohen, Deborah; Basinski, Ralph; Bernhardt, Aaron; Johnston, Tom
Subject: FW: Crane SWMU 12 (Battery Dump Site Risk Evaluation) Draft IMR
Attachments: EPA Question 030315.docx
Signed By: thomas.brent@navy.mil

Pete,

Please see the response to Dan's comment in the attached. Let us know if you or Dan have any further comments or questions.

Thanks,
Tom

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

From: Basinski, Ralph [mailto:Ralph.Basinski@tetrattech.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2015 5:54 PM
To: Brent, Thomas CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, PWD Crane; Cole, Linda L CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, IPTNE
Cc: Bernhardt, Aaron; Cohen, Deborah; Johnston, Tom
Subject: RE: Crane SWMU 12 (Battery Dump Site Risk Evaluation) Draft IMR

Please see the attachment for the answer to EPA's questions.

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

From: Brent, Thomas CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, PWD Crane [mailto:thomas.brent@navy.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 10:07 AM
To: Cole, Linda L CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, IPTNE; Cohen, Deborah
Cc: Basinski, Ralph; Bernhardt, Aaron
Subject: FW: Crane SWMU 12 (Battery Dump Site Risk Evaluation) Draft IMR

Please see Pete's forwarded email below from Dan.

Thanks,
Tom

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

From: Ramanauskas, Peter [mailto:ramanauskas.peter@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 9:31 AM
To: Brent, Thomas CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, PWD Crane
Subject: FW: Crane SWMU 12 (Battery Dump Site Risk Evaluation) Draft IMR

Tom,

See questions below from Dan.

Thanks,

Pete

From: Mazur, Dan
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2015 3:28 PM
To: Ramanauskas, Peter
Subject: Crane SWMU 12 (Battery Dump Site Risk Evaluation) Draft IMR

Peter,

For the ecological risk review of Appendix G, I assume samples represented in Figure 1 (Risk Scenario 1) are the source of data presented in the Human Health (e.g., Table 1-1) and Ecological (e.g., Table 2-1) Risk Scenarios. If Scenario 1 uses the same sample locations and data, I would expect the inner ring average concentration for a chemical to be the same for both Table 1-1 and 2-1. Using zinc as an example, the inner ring average concentration for Table 1-1 (72.18 mg/kg) is different than Table 2-1 (43.3 mg/kg). This difference between the Human Health and Ecological tables repeats for all scenarios, chemicals and rings.

Is a different data set or calculation method used to prepare the data Tables for Human Health than Ecological?

Dan

From: Ramanauskas, Peter
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 11:50 AM
To: Mazur, Dan
Subject: Battery Site SAP

Here's some more recent info I found that should help. Let me know if it is what you were looking for.

Peter

EPA Question
03/03/15
SWMU 12 Battery Disposal Site
Interim Measures Report
NSA Crane, Crane Indiana

Question:

For the ecological risk review of Appendix G, I assume samples represented in Figure 1 (Risk Scenario 1) are the source of data presented in the Human Health (e.g., Table 1-1) and Ecological (e.g., Table 2-1) Risk Scenarios. If Scenario 1 uses the same sample locations and data, I would expect the inner ring average concentration for a chemical to be the same for both Table 1-1 and 2-1. Using zinc as an example, the inner ring average concentration for Table 1-1 (72.18 mg/kg) is different than Table 2-1 (43.3 mg/kg). This difference between the Human Health and Ecological tables repeats for all scenarios, chemicals and rings.

Answer:

The reason that there are differences in the concentrations is only samples from 0-2 feet were used for the Eco Risk average calculation. Therefore, only backfill results, RFI surface samples, and verification samples collected from the excavation walls that extended from the surface to two feet below ground surface (bgs) were used for the calculations in Tables 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3.

The calculations in Tables 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3, for the HH evaluation, included the samples for the eco evaluation PLUS RFI samples collected from 1-3 feet bgs.

This is explained in the second paragraph in Attachment 1 in Appendix G, which states:

"... Note that only surface samples (0-2 feet bgs) were included in the ecological risk scenarios. This means that the ecological scenarios only included backfill results, RFI surface samples, and verification samples collected from the excavation walls that extended from the surface to two feet below ground surface. RFI samples taken at a depth of 1-3 feet below ground surface (soils that remained following excavations) were included in the inner and middle ring human health risk area weighted average calculation..."

The rest the attachment and figures in the attachment explain this in more detail and indicates which samples were used.

No change to the SWMU 12 IMR is necessary to address this question.