

N00102.AR.002852
NSY PORTSMOUTH
5090.3a

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL FOR FINAL PROPOSED PLAN FOR OPERABLE UNIT 9 (OU 9)
AND U S NAVY RESPONSES TO MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION COMMENTS NSY PORTSMOUTH ME
7/12/2013
TETRA TECH



TETRA TECH

PITT-07-13-061

July 12, 2013

Project Number 112G02214

Mr. Matthew Audet
USEPA, Region 1
5 Post Office Square
Suite 100
Mail Code OSRR07-3
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-3912

Mr. Iver McLeod
Maine Department of Environmental Protection
State House Station 17
Augusta, Maine 04333-0017

Reference: Contract No. N62470-08-D-1001 (CLEAN)
Contract Task Order No. WE26

Subject: Final Proposed Plan for Operable Unit 9 and Response to Comments on Draft
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard (PNS), Kittery, Maine

Dear Mr. Audet/Mr. McLeod:

On behalf of the U.S. Navy, Tetra Tech, Inc. is pleased to provide to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region I (USEPA) and to the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP) 2 and 3 copies, respectively, of the Final Proposed Plan for OU9. The Navy's response to MEDEP comment dated June 25, 2013 is also enclosed. USEPA indicated in an email dated June 20, 2013 that they had no comments on the draft document.

The public comment period on the Proposed Plan will be held from July 16 to August 14, 2013. The Proposed Plan provides information (dates, times, and location) for the Public Meeting, which will include an Informational Open House and Public Hearing.

If you have any comments or questions, or if additional information is required, please contact Ms. Elizabeth Middleton at 757.341.1985.

For the Community Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members; if you have any comments or questions on these issues, they can be provided to the Navy at a RAB meeting, by calling the Public Affairs office at 207.438.1140 or by writing to:

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard
Public Affairs Office
Attn: Danna Eddy
Portsmouth, NH 03804-5000

Sincerely,

Matthew Kraus, QEP
Project Manager

MK/clm
Enclosure



TETRA TECH

Mr. Matthew Audet
Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. Iver McLeod
Maine Department of Environmental Protection
July 12, 2013 – Page 2

Electronic Copy via email

Mr. Doug Bogen
Ms. Mary Marshall
Mr. Peter Britz
NH Fish & Game (D. Grout)
Ms. Carolyn Lepage
ME Dept. of Marine Resources (D. Nault)
Dr. Roger Wells
Ms. Diana McNabb
Ms. Lisa Joy
P. Dombrowski
NOAA (K. Finkelstein)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife (K. Munney)

Hard Copy and electronic via email

NAVFAC MIDLANT (Code OPTE3/E. Middleton)
NAVFAC MIDLANT PWD ME (Code PRN4, M. Thyng)
(11 copies)
PNS Code 100PAO (11 copies)
Ms. Deborah Cohen, Tetra Tech
NIRIS RDM

Without Enclosure

Mr. Jack McKenna

**RESPONSE TO MEDEP COMMENT DATED JUNE 25, 2013
DRAFT PROPOSED PLAN FOR OPERABLE UNIT 9
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, KITTERY, MAINE**

1. **Comment:** Step 4, Characterize the Risk, p. 7. The PP states that PAHs potentially under Building 62 Annex are not at concentrations that would pose unacceptable risk due to vapor intrusion. This begs the question that if you don't even know if there is ash under the building then how do you know what concentrations would be. The answer is mentioned in the Feasibility Study in Section 1.6.4, p. 1-13. So the draft PP should say something like, "Specific PAHs that could be released as vapors from soil and move into the air inside buildings have not been found in the ash-contaminated soil at OU9. Therefore, if ash is present under Building 62 Annex it is not expected to pose unacceptable risk due to vapor intrusion to people working in the building."

Response: It is agreed that a presumption was made based on the likely source that, if present, ash under Building 62 Annex would have similar concentrations of PAHs as were detected in ash samples collected around Building 62 Annex. The text will be clarified. The following provides the specific text revisions.

"Specific PAHs that could be released as vapors from soil and move into the air inside buildings (referred to as vapor intrusion) **have not been detected in ash at OU9 at concentrations that would pose unacceptable risk due to vapor intrusion. Therefore, if ash is present under the floor of Building 62 Annex, it is not expected to** ~~are not at concentrations that would pose unacceptable risks~~ **to people working in the building due to vapor intrusion** ~~to people working in Building 62 Annex."~~