

N00102.AR.002427
NSY PORTSMOUTH
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING U S EPA REGION I COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENGINEERING
EVALUATION/COST ANALYSIS FOR SITE 30 NSY PORTSMOUTH ME

6/3/2004

U S EPA REGION I



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
NEW ENGLAND - REGION I
1 CONGRESS STREET, SUITE 1100 (HBT)
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02114-2023

June 3, 2004

Mr. Frederick J. Evans, P.E.
Remedial Project Manager
Engineering Field Activity Northeast
10 Industrial Hwy., Mail Stop #82
Lester, PA 19113-2090

Re: ***Draft Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EE/CA), Site 30 (Building 184),
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine***

Dear Mr. Evans:

I have reviewed the April 2004 subject document prepared by Tetra Tech NUS, Inc, on behalf of the Navy. The Agency's comments are attached.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at audet.matthew@epa.gov or 617.918.1449.

Sincerely,

Matthew R. Audet

Matthew R. Audet, P.G.
Remedial Project Manager
Office of Site Remediation and Restoration

cc. Iver McLeod/ME DEP
Marty Raymond/PNS
Deb Cohen/Tetra Tech NUS
Carolyn Lepage/Lepage Environmental (email)
RAB Members (email)

Attachment 1
US EPA Comments to Draft Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EE/CA),
Site 30 (Building 184), Portsmouth Naval Shipyard

1. EPA agrees with the Navy's recommended alternative.
2. In responding to prior EPA comment, (May 5, 2003, Comment No. 4) the Navy acknowledged the less than full characterization of the hydrogeologic connection between the pits and groundwater. Given the chosen alternative's undetermined schedule for source removal the Navy should include a plan to monitor groundwater.
3. EPA remains unconvinced that existing monitoring wells are adequate to monitor groundwater migration (May 5, 2003, Comment No. 3).
4. EPA would like to see a more specific projection for the interim period.