

N00210.AR.001016  
NSTC GREAT LAKES, IL  
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGARDING DRAFT FINAL FEASIBILITY STUDY FORT SHERIDAN IL  
6/26/2001  
ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Copy to: Bryan Holthrop 167  
Mattinson 2 Jul 01



ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

1021 NORTH GRAND AVENUE EAST, P.O. BOX 19276, SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62794-9276

(217) 557-8155  
(FAX) 782-3258

THOMAS V. SKINNER, DIRECTOR

June 26, 2001

United States Army  
c/o Ms. Colleen Reilly  
Fort Sheridan BRAC Office  
3155 Blackhawk Drive Suite 17  
Fort Sheridan, IL 60037-1289

Re: Draft Final Feasibility Study DOD OU  
Fort Sheridan, Illinois

0970555001/Lake  
Fort Sheridan (BRAC)  
Superfund/Technical

Dear Ms. Reilly:

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Illinois EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document. It was dated April, 2001 and received on April 30, 2001.

Illinois EPA's comments are as follows:

- 1) Section 1.3.3.1, The next to last sentence states that "The majority of the landfill currently is paved and used for parking lots." This description has been amended in Section 2.1 as per the response to Illinois EPA comment #8 to the draft feasibility study. Please amend it here also, to be consistent.
- 2) Section 2.1.2, pg 2-4 6<sup>th</sup> bullet, The cancer risk is stated to be "... at the target of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ ." This is not the target. The target, or goal, should always be to be below  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ . The risk management range is between the two. This should be clarified. Need to state that the result is within the target risk range.
- 3) Section 2.2.2, pg 2-14 7<sup>th</sup> bullet, See previous comment.
- 4) Section 2.3.3, pg 2-22, The first line states that "The noncancer HIs reach but do not exceed the target HI of 1 ..." The listed HIs are both below 1. This sentence should be corrected.
- 5) Section 2.4.2, pg 2-30 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet, It states that "The noncancer HI for the child reaches but does not exceed the target HI of 1 ..." The listed HI is below 1. Please correct.

GEORGE H. RYAN, GOVERNOR

- 6) Section 2.5.2, pg 2-32 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet, See comment #2 above.
- 7) Figures 2.6-1 and 2.6-2, The fence line is not apparent. It is labeled in the Legend, but does not appear on the maps.
- 8) Figure 2.6-3, How was the curve generated? Was it quadratic? Forced through zero? How was it weighted? Please clarify this in the text and on the figure.
- 9) Section 2.6.4 and 2.6.5, The value of 5700 ppm for exceedance of the TCLP RCRA level should be listed as an approximate value as this is based on a generated best fit curve not an exact calculation.
- 10) Section 2.7.2, pg 2-38 1<sup>st</sup> bullet, See comment #2 above.
- 11) Section 2.8.2, pg 2-43 1<sup>st</sup> bullet, The cancer risk is not below the target risk cancer range. It is within it. Please correct.
- 12) Figure 3.4-15, I am not confident that the contour lines drawn for lead concentrations are drawn accurately, but upon excavation (if performed), closure samples will need to be taken and this should (hopefully) catch any missed lead-contaminated soil.

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, you may contact me at 217/557-8155.

Sincerely,

*Brian A. Conrath*

Brian A. Conrath, Remedial Project Manager  
Federal Facilities Unit  
Federal Site Remedial Section  
Bureau of Land

BAC:pl:sdn:H:\fortsh\FSrvw\LET

cc: Owen Thompson, USEPA (HSRL-5J)  
Chuck Lechner, USACE  
Mark Shultz, US Navy - EFA Midwest  
Kurt Zacharias, US Army Reserve  
Chris Karem, P.E. USACE-Louisville