

N50092.AR.000063
JEB FORT STORY, VA
5090.3a

LETTER OFFERING COMMENTS ON FIREFIGHTER TRAINING AREA, LIGHTER
AMPHIBIOUS RESUPPLY CARGO (LARC) 60 MAINTENANCE AREA, AND AUTO CRAFT
AREA DRAFT REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT, HUMAN HEALTH AND ECOLOGICAL
RISK ASSESSMENTS FORT STORY VA

11/25/1997

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

George Allen
Governor

Street address: 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219

Thomas L. Hopkins
Director

Mailing address: P.O. Box 10009, Richmond, Virginia 23240

Fax (804) 698-4500 TDD (804) 698-4021

(804) 698-4000

Becky Norton Dunlop
Secretary of Natural Resources

<http://www.deq.state.va.us>

1-800-592-5482

November 25, 1997

Commander
US Army Transportation Center
ATZF-PWE (Mr. Musel)
Building 1407, Room 111
Fort Eustis, Virginia 23604-5332

Dear Mr. Musel:

Thank you for providing the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Federal Facilities and Superfund, the opportunity to review the "Firefighter Training Area, Larc 60 Maintenance Area, and Auto Craft Building Area, Draft Remedial Investigation Report, Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments." Attached are comments on the evaluation of screening levels and selection of compounds of concern. Comments have not been provided on the risk assessment of each site. Comments on the risk assessment will be provided following the toxicologist's review.

If there are questions or comments, please contact me at (804) 698-4192.

Sincerely,

Durwood H. Willis
Environmental Program Manager

Enclosure

cc: Erica S. Dameron, DEQ
Larry McBride, DEQ

Comments on Fort Story

1. **Table 6-1** indicates the TPH levels in surface soils as high as 5300 mg/kg. Would TPH at these concentrations be of concern?
2. **Table 6-2** indicates zinc was present at a level exceeding the Va. groundwater criteria in at least one of three samples. Any parameter exceeding an established criterion is a potential concern and may be a candidate for additional evaluation.
3. **Page 6-32** indicates that there is a non-potable well at the LARC 60 Maintenance but there are no exposed populations to the groundwater. The text should be expanded to describe how this groundwater is used resulting in no exposure. Based on this response appropriate changes may necessary in the risk assessment.
4. **Table 6-27** indicates levels of methylene chloride and TCE exceeding the soil to groundwater transfer screening levels. It appears that these two compounds should be of concern since they exceed the screening level and they were detected in more than 5% of the samples. The text on page 6-52 indicates that PCE exceeded the soil to groundwater transfer screening criterion. Should the text address TCE rather PCE?
5. After consideration of the comment #3, the Chemicals of Potential Concern on **Page 6-53** could be modified. Any changes should be carried forward in the risk assessment.
6. On **Page 6-54** under Future Land Use, the text references the LARC 60 Maintenance Area rather than the Auto Craft site.