

N00102.AR.001859  
NSY PORTSMOUTH  
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM U S EPA REGION I REGARDING DRAFT DECISION  
DOCUMENT FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNITS 12, 13, 16 AND 23 AND DRAFT  
CONSENSUS DOCUMENT FOR SOIL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT 21 NSY  
PORTSMOUTH ME  
5/16/1996  
U S EPA REGION I



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION I

J.F. KENNEDY FEDERAL BUILDING, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02203-2211

May 16, 1996

Commanding Officer  
Attn: Code 1823/LT. Conroy  
NORTHNAVFACENGCOM  
10 Industrial Hwy., MSC. 82  
Lester, PA 19113-2090

Re: Draft Decision Document, No Further Action, SWMUs 12, 13, 16 and 23  
Draft Consensus Document, No Further Action for Soil, SWMU 21  
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard  
Kittery, Maine

Dear Jim:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the documents entitled "Draft Decision Document, No Further Action, SWMUs 12, 13, 16 and 23" and "Draft Consensus Document, No Further Action for Soil, SWMU 21" for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, Maine. The documents are dated March 1996.

Attachment I includes comments on the Draft Decision Document, No Further Action, SWMUs 12, 13, 16 and 23. Comments on the Draft Consensus Document, No Further Action for Soil, SWMU 21 are provided in Attachment II to this letter.

Please feel free to contact me at (617)573-5785 to discuss the enclosed comments.

Sincerely,

Meghan F. Cassidy  
Remedial Project Manager

Enclosures

cc: Nancy Beardsley/ME DEP  
Fran Endyke/PNS  
Fred Evans/NORDIV  
Andrea Sewall/CDM FPC  
Sarah Levison/EPA



## ATTACHMENT I

The following are EPA's comments on the document entitled "Draft Decision Document, No Further Action, SWMUs 12, 13, 16 and 23" for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The document is dated March 1996.

### GENERAL

1. Since tanks at SWMUs 13, 16 and 23 were removed according to closure plans approved by MEDEP, documents related to the closure of these SWMUs (i.e., a "Closure or Completion Report") should be referenced in the No Further Action Decision Document (NFADD), if available. If such documents are not available, the NFADD should be revised to document whether MEDEP personnel were present during the removal activities. In addition, documentation related to the disposal of the tanks and their contents also needs to be referenced.

### SPECIFIC

1. Page 2: EPA signature block should be for Paula Fitzsimmons.
2. Section 1.0 Declaration - As outlined in OSWER Directive 9355.3-02 (July 1989), the text on page 2 under Declaration Statement should be revised to state that since the interim remedial actions conducted at SWMUs 13, 16 and 23 did not result in the need for either institutional or engineering controls to prevent unacceptable exposure to hazardous substances, five-year reviews are not required at these sites.
3. Section 3.0 SWMU 12 - Boiler Blowdown Tank No. 25 - Although the contents of the tank are not classified as characteristic hazardous waste under RCRA, a statement should be added under Site Characteristics documenting why the metals levels found in the tank are "considered suitable for direct discharge to the sanitary sewer system" (i.e., the levels found meet requirements of the discharge permit, etc.) In addition, a statement needs to be added to the text on page 7 under Summary of Site Risks to document why neither current nor future occupational exposures associated with this tank exist.
4. Section 4.0: Confirm whether the MPSs consider or take into account the leaching of contaminants from the soils to the groundwater. If not, the text should include a discussion regarding why this is not expected to result in any increase risk (in particular, to ecological receptors as the groundwater discharges to the Piscataqua River).
5. Section 4.0 SWMU 13 - Rinse Water Tank No. 27 - The text on page 8 under Site Characteristics states that "there are no exceedances of Future Industrial Land Use MPSs" associated with the contaminants found in the confirmation soil samples; however, a comparison of the results to respective Media Protection Standards(MPSs) has not been presented in Table 4-1. The table should be revised to include the respective MPSs as supporting documentation of the No Further Action (NFA) decision for this SWMU. In

addition, the text found in the Summary of Site Risks should also be revised to include the average and maximum cumulative risk values obtained for the future use scenarios described, rather than simply state that the risks "are less than  $10E-6$  for carcinogens". Specific documentation is required to fully support the NFA decision.

6. Section 5.0 SWMU 16 - Rinse Water Tank No. 34 - Similar to the previous comment regarding SWMU 13, Table 5-1 should be revised to include the MPS values referenced in the text.
7. Section 6.0 SWMU 23 - Chemical Cleaning Facility Tank (Building 174) - Similar to previous comments, Table 6-1 should be revised to include the MPS values referenced in the text.

## ATTACHMENT II

The following are EPA's comments on the document entitled "Draft Consensus Document, No Further Action for Soil, SWMU 21" for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The document is dated March 1996.

### GENERAL

1. Based on a review of the results of the interim remedial action (tank removal) conducted for SWMU 21, it appears EPA cannot consent to a No Further Action (NFA) decision for soils until several questions are resolved. Given that tank removal activities revealed the presence of a large hole in the tank, as well as visually contaminated materials that do not appear to have been removed (July 1992 McLaren/Hart RFI Report), it is not apparent whether all necessary actions on soils in the SWMU 21 area have been undertaken.

### SPECIFIC

1. 1.0 Declaration - This draft Consensus Document for No Further Action for Soils at SWMU 21 appears to contradict the conclusions and recommendations presented in the McLaren/Hart Draft RFI Report (July 17, 1992) which stated that visually contaminated soils were left in place following tank removal and backfilling operations. The report recommended that the excavation be re-opened, that the contaminated soils be removed and that post-excavation sampling be conducted to "confirm remediation effectiveness". As such, the text on page 1 under Description of No Further Remedial Action for Soils which states that no further action is recommended based on "interim remedial actions to remove the tank" needs to be further justified.
2. Page 2, top para.: The text should specify that the risks are within EPA's acceptable risk range.
3. Declaration Statement: Each statement in this paragraph must specify "soils only".
4. 2.0 Decision Summary - The text on page 6 under Site Characteristics states that "stained fill and exposed bedrock were evident" and that some of the tank contents spilled onto the fill material during removal. The text also states that "the excavation was backfilled with clean fill material.". The document should be revised to state how the excavated fill materials were handled and/or disposed of and the extent to which contaminated fill materials were left in place.
5. 2.0 Decision Summary - Similar to comments provided on the NFADD for SWMUs 12, 13, 16 and 23, Table 2-1 should be revised to include the MPS values referenced in the text on page 7 under Site Characteristics.