N50092.AR.000102
JEB FORT STORY, VA
5090.3a

LETTER OFFERING COMMENTS ON DRAFT REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT FIREFIGHTER TRAINING AREA, LIGHTER AMPHIBIOUS RESUPPLY CARGO (LARC) 60 MAINTENANCE AREA, AND AUTO CRAFT AREA FORT STORY VA
5/24/1996
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

0102

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Peter W. Schmidt
Director

P. O. Box 10009
Richmond, Virginia 23240-0009
(804) 762-4000

May 24, 1996

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

Dear Mr. Musel:

Thank you for providing the Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Federal Facilities Restoration and Superfund, the opportunity to review the draft "Remedial Investigation Report Firefighter Training Area, LARC 60 Maintenance Area, Auto Craft Building Area, Fort Story, Virginia December 1995".

Attached are the staffs' comments concerning the Fort Story Report. If you have any questions concerning these comments please contact me at (804) 698-4192.

Sincerely,

Durwood H. Willis

Durwood H. Willis
Office of Federal Facilities
Restoration and Superfund

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

Comments on the responses to comments on "Remedial Investigation Report Firefighter Training Area, LARC 60 Maintenance Area, Auto Craft Building Area, Fort Story December, 1995".

6. The response adequately explains why there were no inorganics analyzed for 4MW-4. However, it does not explain what will be done to fill the resulting data Gap.

35. Were the trigger levels in the PA/SI adequate to determine that there is no potential for either human health or ecological risk? Were data provided that verify that pesticide levels were consistent with levels resulting from pest control (i.e. anthropogenic background). The soil boring within the LARC Maintenance Area contains the DDT metabolite, p,p'DDD at a concentration of 2.9 mg/kg. Additional discussion regarding this issue should be included in the RI document. Additional investigation of all three sites would adequately address the original comment.

36. Were the trigger levels used in the PA/SI adequate to determine that there is no potential for either human health or ecological risk?

59. This explanation should be included in the text of the report.

65. What is the source of the results for fluoranthene, benzo(g,h,i)perylene, and pyrene provided in the report? Surface soil sample SB07-004-24 is apparently mislabeled in the data summary table. This should be corrected or explained.

67., 68., 70. The report should provide a reference that would verify the assumption that the PAHs detected in this area are due to leaching from the asphalt.