

Responses to Comments  
Draft Proposed Plan  
Site 2: Waste Disposal Area B  
St. Juliens Creek Annex  
Chesapeake, Virginia

PREPARED FOR: Walt Bell, NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic  
Robert Stroud, EPA Region III  
Karen Doran, VDEQ

PREPARED BY: CH2M HILL

DATE: February 11, 2010

**Comments from EPA, provided 11 February 2010**

1. **Comment:** *Section 2.2: Make sure that the website link is valid and correct.*

**Response:** The website link has been corrected.

2. **Comment:** *Section 3.1 indicates that several sources of contamination have been identified at the site and Section 3.3 says that Site 2 consists of mixed municipal waste. Please clarify the difference.*

**Response:** In order to explain the nature and extent of contamination, Section 3.1 lists the sources of contamination at the site, one of which is buried waste. The mixed municipal waste referred to in Section 3.3 is the buried waste listed in Section 3.1. The second sentence of Section 3.3 has been revised to clarify that the waste referred to in the sentence is the buried waste discussed in Section 3.1, as follows, "The waste at Site 2 consists of mixed municipal waste and is not considered a principal threat waste."

3. **Comment:** *Page 7, Paragraph 4: Include the breakdown of sites, i.e. 59 potentially contaminated ERP sites, how many MRP sites, how many SWMUs and how many AOCs.*

**Response:** The second sentence of the fourth paragraph has been revised as follows, "Fifty-nine potentially contaminated Installation Restoration Program sites; 26 ERP sites, one Munitions Response Program (MRP) site, 13 SWMUs, and 20 AOCs, have been identified."

4. **Comment:** *Section 5.1, Page 7: Include the section of the ERI where the VOCs that were detected in deep groundwater were found to be the result of monitoring well installation.*

**Response:** A reference to Section 3.1 of the Proposed Plan has been added to the fifth sentence. Section 3.1 provides an explanation of why the VOCs detected in deep groundwater were attributed to monitoring well installation.

5. **Comment:** *Page 9, Shallow Groundwater, fourth bullet: This bullet indicates that based on high mobility 2,6-dinitrotoluene would not migrate across the site. If something is highly mobile why would it not migrate?*

**Response:** Because 2,6-dinitrotoluene is considered highly mobile, if it were migrating across the site it would have been detected in more than one well. Therefore, it is believed that it is naturally degrading. The bullet has been revised as follows, "The explosive is naturally degrading. Based on its highly mobile characteristic, the explosive would have been detected in more than one well if it had migrated across the site".

**6. Comment:** *Page 17: Change my contact information to the following:*

*Mr. Robert W. Stroud*

*EPA/ESC*

*701 Mapes Road*

*Fort Meade, MD 20755*

*Phone : (410) 305-2748*

*Fax: (410) 305-3096*

*Email - stroud.robert@epa.gov*

**Response:** The requested change has been made.