



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION II
290 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007-1866

NOV 25 2003

Ms. Michelle DiGeambardino, Project Manager
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop 82
Lester, PA 19113-2090

Re: Feasibility Study for Site 26 (OU-7), August, 2003

Dear Ms. DiGeambardino,

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in accordance with our Federal Facility Agreement with the Navy, has reviewed the above referenced report prepared by Tetra Tech Nus, Inc. Attached are our comments.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (212) 637-3921.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jessica Mollin".

Jessica Mollin, Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Section

cc: L. Burg, Naval Weapons Station Earle
B. Marcolina, NJDEP

Comments on Feasibility Study - OU-7

1. Page ES-1, 2nd paragraph. Indicate which solvents were in the OU-3 solvent plume. Give date of RI/FS for OU-3.
2. Figure ES-3. Include boundary lines of site on this map.
3. Page ES-7, 3rd paragraph. State that the PCE concentrations were found to be lower than the TCE levels, give an example. Explain where the location of the PCE source is postulated or indicate that is unclear.
4. Page ES-7, 4th paragraph, 1st sentence. The AS/SVE system is remediating the plume/soil, not the TCE and PCE sources. Include information on sources in this paragraph (e.g., building GB1 activities, leach tank).
5. Page ES-8, Alternatives Development. A treatment alternative needs to be added as a fourth alternative. Under this alternative, the Navy could still make the case that it wouldn't be cost effective or practical due to low levels of PCE which are spread out over a large heavily wooded area, that no one is drinking the water, that there are no near downgradient receptors, that there are no associated environmental impacts, etc. Including a treatment alternative in the PRAP/ROD is needed to demonstrate that treatment was at least considered even though it was found to be impractical and help to explain the preference for monitoring and institutional controls.
6. Page ES-10, 3rd paragraph, last sentence. Change UO to OU.
7. A map should be included which delineates the two plumes, where they overlap and the difference in concentrations.
8. Page 4-6, 4th paragraph. Explain why personal protective equipment (PPE) is needed for site workers for Alternative 3 and why it isn't needed for the other alternatives..