DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NORTHERN DIVISION
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
10 INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY
MAIL STOP, #82
LESTER, PA 19113-2090

IN REPLY REFER TO

5090
Ser: 2468/jpk/1821

APR 27 1995

Mr. Robert Marcolina
New Jersey Dept. of Environmental Protection
Bureau of Federal Case Management
401 East State Street CN 028
Trenton, NJ 08625-0028

Re: DRAFT REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION WORK PLAN
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION EARLE, COLTS NECK, NJ

Responses are attached for each of the comments provided in your letter of April 5, 1995 regarding the subject document. These responses incorporate all of the agreements made during the meeting of April 20, 1995 at NWS Earle which was attended by representatives of USEPA, NJDEP, the Navy and our contractor. By copy of this letter, our contractor is directed to incorporate these changes into a final work plan. As agreed during the meeting, field work will commence prior to finalization of the work plan but any amended sections will be presented for review prior to implemnentation.

If you have any further questions or need additonal information, please call me at (610 595-0567 ext. 157.

Sincerely,

JOHN KOLICIUS
Remedial Project Manager
By direction of the
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
Mr. Jeffrey Gratz, USEPA
Mr. Greg Goepfert, NWS Earle
Mr. Rick Gorrell, Halliburton NUS

NAVY RESPONSES TO NEW JERSEY LETTER OF APRIL 5, 1995
COMMENTS ON DRAFT REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION WORKPLAN
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION EARLE - FEBRUARY 1995

General Comments:

1) The horizontal boundaries of the landfill sites are defined by topographic evidence as well as the older growth woodlands which surround the sites. Additional test pits at this time would add little to the investigation. Any questionable boundaries will be confirmed during remedial design, if necessary.

2) Our contractor will determine whether the lab subcontractor has been approved by NJDEP for chromium analysis. If it hasn't, alternative arrangements will be made with an approved lab.

3) The work plan specifies preparation of trip blanks no longer than 24 hours prior to a sampling event. The need for an extended turnaround time is not anticipated.

4) Ground water contour maps and tabulated ground water level information will be included in the final R.I. report.

5) The hydrocarbon mode will be used for hydropunch studies.

6) As discussed at the TRC meeting of April 10, the Navy has worked with the Monmouth County Health Dept. to obtain a map of this nature which shows drainage areas, streams and wetlands. Mr. Jargowsky of the Health Dept. indicated they have an overlay of the geologic formations, so we could replace the wetlands overlay with this one.

7) With the switch to low-flow sampling using dedicated bladder pumps, only unfiltered samples will be collected.

8) USEPA and NJDEP will be invited to field verify all proposed well locations.

Page/Section Specific Comments:

1) The Burmeister classification system will be used for lithologic descriptions.

2) Well development will not be performed by bailing only.

3) The specific explosives to be analyzed are listed in footnote (7) to Table 3-2 on page 3-21.

4) As agreed at our 4/20 meeting, existing wells will only be re-developed if less than 90% of the well screen remains open to the formation.

5) The hydrocarbon mode will be used for hydropunch studies.

6) As agreed at our 4/20 meeting, HP-8 will be moved into the apparent burn area.

7) A table of this type will be included in the R.I. report.

8) The location of MW3-1 in figure 6-1 will be corrected.

9) Hydropunches H-6 AND H-7 will be moved to the requested locations, if possible. Locations will be field verified.

10) The area noted does not routinely have standing water, so a staff gauge would not be appropriate here.

11) Tank closure reports will be referenced in the R.I. report where appropriate.

12) The text on page 18-7 was revised in the April submission to indicate up to 8 monitoring wells, based on the soil gas results. Table 18-2 will be modified to reflect this.

13) Location of the soil borings will be based on visual evidence as well as the soil gas survey.

14) Since this tank is accessible and there is reason to believe industrial wastes could have entered it, the sludge and liquid samples requested will be obtained. We don't want this to set a precedent for other septic sampling, though.

15) Tank closure reports will be referenced in the R.I. report where appropriate. Based on the system configuration, there is no reason to suspect any use of the septic system other than sanitary wastes.

16) There is no apparent pathway between the pit and Mingamahone Brook. Please note that Mingamahone Brook will be sampled at the NWS boundary for overall watershed evaluation.

The septic tank at this location was pumped out within the last year. If disposal records do not provide sufficient information regarding the tank's contents, a sample of the tank will be considered.

The final location of monitoring well 26-5 will be based upon the results of the soil gas survey.

The 3x3 pad identified in the figure is a fill port for the new underground storage tank.

17) The pipe cited could not be located in the field. Is any additional information available regarding its location?

18) No reference to oil-soaked wood chips could be found. The proposed sampling plan addresses all visibly impacted areas.

19) The revised sampling strategy which was agreed upon during our 4/20 meeting will be employed. This includes 2 soil borings, 4 hydropunches, 1 sediment sample from the pond and 1 6-12" soil sample from the area downgradient of the first oil-water separators.

20) As noted at our 4/20 meeting, the proposed background sampling locations were selected using the regional surface geology map cited in your General Comment #6. All sampling locations will be field verified.