

N62661.AR.003106
NS NEWPORT
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT REGARDING DRAFT FINAL FEASIBILITY STUDY SITE 19 FORMER
DERECKTOR SHIPYARD MARINE SEDIMENT NS NEWPORT RI
2/14/2014
RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT



RHODE ISLAND
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

235 Promenade Street, Providence, RI 02908-5767

TDD 401-222-4462

Newport
Site 19
045

14 February 2014

Mr. Dominic O'Connor, P.E.
NAVFAC MIDLANT (Code OPTE3)
Environmental Restoration
Building Z-144, Room 109
9742 Maryland Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23511-3095

Re: Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS)
Site 19 - Former Derecktor Shipyard Marine Sediment
Naval Station Newport, RI

Dear Mr. O'Connor,

The Office of Waste Management at the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (RIDEM) has conducted a review of the *Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS)* dated February 2014 for Site 19 - Former Derecktor Shipyard Marine Sediment, Naval Station Newport, located in Newport and Middletown, RI. As a result of this review, this Office has generated the attached comments on the *Draft Final FS*.

If you have any questions in regards to this letter, please contact me at (401) 222-2797, extension 7020 or by e-mail at pamela.crump@dem.ri.gov.

Sincerely,

Pamela E. Crump, Sanitary Engineer
Office of Waste Management

cc: Matthew DeStefano, RIDEM
Richard Gottlieb, RIDEM
Lisa McIntosh, W&C
Darlene Ward, NSN
Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Region I
Steve Parker, Tetra Tech
Ken Munney, USF&WS
Ken Finkelstein, NOAA

**RIDEM's Comments (2/14/14) on the
Draft Final Feasibility Study (2/3/14)
Site 19 - Former Derecktor Shipyard Marine Sediment
Naval Station Newport, RI**

General Comments:

1. Alternative 4.

The cover letter states, "*This report was prepared based on our understanding from the October 23, 2013 meeting that Alternative SD4 would remain as previously presented, without addition of LUCs and long term monitoring at dredged/backfilled areas.*" Please note that the team agreed on October 23, 2013 to include long-term monitoring (LTM) and LUCs for SD4. One of the action items from this meeting was "*Add chemical monitoring to backfill areas under Alternative 4*", as stated in the meeting notes. However, it appears that following this meeting, the Navy discussed this issue further internally and has gone back to its original position regarding backfill for SD4, which is that the backfilled areas in SD4 should not be considered a cap that would require LTM and LUCs.

Please indicate, in all relevant sections of this FS, that RIDEM continues to believe that Alternative SD4 should require LTM and LUCs for the open water areas in addition to the capped areas under Pier 2, due to contamination that would be left in place underneath the backfill, which in some areas is 2-5 or 5-10 times greater than the PRG(s). The backfill would therefore serve as a cover to prevent exposure to contamination below 1 foot. The LTM and LUCs required for SD4 would limit the use of this Site and increase the total cost for this alternative. Please note that if Alternative SD4 is chosen as the preferred alternative in the Proposed Plan, this issue will need to be resolved prior to the Record of Decision.

Specific Comments:

1. p. ES-8, PRG table.

Please include a footnote regarding the projected SWAC value for lead, explaining the slight exceedance of the PRG for Alternative SD5. Please indicate in this FS that there is agency consensus on allowing this exceedance in this circumstance.

2. p. 1-39, Asbestos.

Please remove "*and is therefore not further discussed in this FS.*" Asbestos is further discussed in this FS since prevention of exposure to asbestos is a remedial action objective (RAO) for this Site, which is addressed with LUCs for every alternative presented in this document.

3. p. 2-5, Section 2.2.1, Identification of Media of Concern; 4th paragraph, 1st sentence.

Please correct the location of DSY-29. According to Figure 1-6, it is located near the T-wharf, not Pier 1.

4. p. 2-11, Section 2.2.2.3; last paragraph, last sentence.

"All these factors combine to agree that a PRG of 539 µg/kg for benzo(a)pyrene in depositional marine sediment is justifiably conservative to support a remedial action."

RIDEM does not consider the PRG for benzo(a)pyrene to be conservative. Therefore, please change *"justifiably conservative"* to *"acceptable"* or *"appropriate"*.

5. p. 3-29, Section 3.5, Alternative 4.

Please see general comment #1.

6. p. 4-1, Section 4.0, Alternative 4.

Please see general comment #1.

7. p. 4-13, Section 4.1.4, Alternative 4; whole section.

Please see general comment #1.

8. p. 4-17, Section 4.1.5, Alternative 5; table.

Please add a footnote to this table discussing the lead PRG. See specific comment #1.

9. p. 4-36, Section 4.3.4; whole section.

Please see general comment #1.

10. p. 4-36, Section 4.3.4; 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence.

Please note that this sentence discusses implementing LUCs for the backfilled areas.

11. p. 4-42, Section 4.3.5, Alternative 5: Target Dredging and Backfill; 2nd paragraph; 3rd sentence.

Please discuss the SWAC instead of the VWAC, since it was suggested during the October 23, 2013 meeting that all discussion of the VWAC be removed from this FS.

12. p. 4-42, Section 4.3.5, Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment; 2nd sentence.

Please correct *"caped"* to *"capped"*.

13. p. 4-46, Section 4.4, Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment; 1st paragraph; 1st (continued) sentence on page.

Please indicate in this section that RIDEM believes that Alternative 4 would restrict the use of the port and depth of the vessels utilizing the port. See general comment #1.

14. p. 4-48, Section 4.4, 1st paragraph, last sentence.

Please see general comment #1.

15. Tables in Sections 2 and 4.

Please correct the spelling of "*Feasibility*" in the header of the tables.

16. Table 4-16, p. 2 of 3, Row - Environmental Impacts, Column – SD3.

Please correct the spelling of "*temporary*".