

N00102.AR.002570
NSY PORTSMOUTH
5090.3a

EMAIL AND COMMENTS FROM MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION REGARDING DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR OPERABLE UNIT 2 (OU 2)
NSY PORTSMOUTH ME
03/10/2011
MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Cohen, Deborah

From: McLeod, Iver J [Iver.J.McLeod@Maine.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2011 5:03 PM
To: Cole, Linda L CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, IPTNE
Cc: Lipfert, Gail E; Wolfe, Theodore E; audet.matthew@epa.gov; Cohen, Deborah; Thyng, Frederick M CIV NAVFAC MIDLANT, PWD Maine; dbogen@metrocast.net; jcarter@kitteryme.org; Mary Marshall; michele.dionne@maine.edu; Plbritz@ch.cityofportsmouth.com; Roger Wells; thegoobers@comcast.net
Subject: Navy Responses to MEDEP Comments on Draft OU2 FS, Portsmouth NSY, Kittery, ME

Hi Linda,

MEDEP has completed its review of the Navy's responses to MEDEP comments on the Draft FS Report for OU2. For the most part, the Navy has adequately addressed MEDEP's concerns. The Jan. 20, 2011 conference call between the Navy, TetraTech NUS and the MEDEP was very helpful in resolving these issues in a timely manner. Our comments on the responses are below.

1. RTC 19. The Navy indicated that cross-sections from the March 2010 Supplemental RI Report for OU2 would be included in Section 4.0 of the OU2 FS Report. The draft final OU2 FS does not include these cross-sections.
2. RTC 22. "As discussed in the January 20, 2011 conference call, water beneath OU2 is tidally influenced by infiltrating seawater...Text will be added to the conceptual site model discussion on page 1-25 to indicate that groundwater at OU2 is tidally influenced by river water that infiltrates the site twice daily." This description isn't quite accurate. Our notes from the Jan. 20 conference call indicate that we reiterated that the groundwater at OU2 isn't fresh groundwater influenced by river water - it IS river water (that is slightly diluted by fresh groundwater). We agree that this river water should be evaluated as groundwater for potential exposure and evaluation of risks at the DRMO. However, for the sake of accuracy, it is an important distinction that should be clarified in the site conceptual model discussed in Section 1.
3. RTC 25. The Navy stated that an explanation of EPCs would be included as part of Attachment A in the DF FS. We could not find this explanation.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Iver McLeod
Project Manager
Bureau of Remediation and Waste Management
Maine DEP Augusta, ME 04333

iver.j.mcleod@maine.gov
ph: (207) 287-8010
fx: (207) 287-7826