

N00174.PF.000905
NSWC INDIAN HEAD
5090.3b

LETTER AND MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT COMMENTS TO DRAFT
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT JUNE 2012 NSWC INDIAN HEAD MD (PUBLIC DOCUMENT)
7/2/2012
MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT



MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

1800 Washington Boulevard • Baltimore MD 21230

410-537-3000 • 1-800-633-6101

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Robert M. Summers, Ph.D.
Secretary

Anthony G. Brown
Lieutenant Governor

July 2, 2012

Mr. Joseph Rail, P.E.
NAVFAC Washington
Washington Navy Yard, Bld. 212
1314 Harwood Street SE
Washington, DC 20374-5018

Re: Draft Five-Year Review Report, Naval Supply Facility Indian Head, Indian Head, Maryland
– June 2012

Dear Mr. Rail:

The Federal Facilities Division of the Maryland Department of the Environment's Land Restoration Program offers the enclosed comments on the above referenced document.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (410) 537-3791.

Sincerely,

Curtis DeTore
Section Head
Federal Facilities Division

CD:cd

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Dennis Orenshaw
Mr. Horacio Tablada
Mr. James Carroll

**Maryland Department of the Environment
Land Restoration Program
Federal Facilities Division**

Comments on:

Draft Five-Year Review Report, Naval Supply Facility Indian Head,
Indian Head, Maryland – June 2012

General Comments:

- 1) This draft document requires proofreading and editing to correct spelling, grammatical and formatting errors.
- 2) Please spell out all acronyms when used for the first time in the text. Also ensure that these acronyms are included on the List of Acronyms.
- 3) Text for each site needs to be updated to reflect the most current conditions.
- 4) It would better serve the reader if the majority of text in the “Previous Investigations” sections for each site was simply replaced with the appropriate “Chronology of Site” table.
- 5) The “Summary of Contamination” sections for each site are excessively long and overly detailed. A short narrative stating what media is contaminated and what contaminants of concern are present should suffice. The appropriate Remedial Investigation (RI) should also be referenced.
- 6) The “Risk Assessment Summary” sections are not needed. Please remove them.
- 7) The “Remedial Actions” sections for each site are also excessively long and overly detailed. A table like the enclosed Example 1 accompanied by a short introduction would be preferable.
- 8) Instead of supplying detailed figures reproduced from the RI and site photographs only on a CD-ROM, it would benefit the reader if simple figures depicting needed data and appropriate site photos were included in each chapter.

Specific Comments:

- 1) Title Page
This page should be revised to reference Naval Support Facility Indian Head.
- 2) Five-Year Review Summary Form
Other 5-year Reviews completed for military facilities in Maryland have completed these forms for each site discussed in the document. The Navy should prepare similar forms for this facility.

The Federal Facilities Division requests clarification as to the source of information for the July 2006 Construction Completion date.

Please change the Due Date to July 26, 2012.

- 3) Figure 1-2
March Island is incorrectly labeled. It should be Marsh Island.
- 4) Page 2-1, Section 2.1, first paragraph, second sentence
Please remove "Site 11" from this sentence.
- 5) Page 2-1, Section 2.0
The text in this section is worded in a manner that implies the Environmental Protection Agency and the Maryland Department of the Environment have been reviewing this document since March 2012. This is not correct as both regulatory agencies received the document in June 2012.
- 6) Page 4-1, Section 4.1.1, first and second paragraphs
The referenced figure in both of these paragraphs is incorrect. It should be Figure 4-1 in each case.
- 7) Page 9-1, Section 9.1.1
The reference for Figure 1-1 should be changed to Figure 1-2 and the reference for Table 2-1 should be changed to Table 9-1.
- 8) Page 9-10, Section 9.5.2, first line on page
Please correct the misspelled acronym "OC."

Example Table 1

Operable Unit	CERCLA Status	Alternatives Evaluated	Selected Remedy	Implementation
River Lane Dump	ROD, 1992	1. No Action 2. Impermeable Cap 3. Soil Cover 4. Clean Closure	Soil Cover	The selected remedy has been implemented as described in the ROD.
Lead Contaminated Soil Area Transformer Storage Area	ROD, 2008	<u>Lead Contaminated Soil Area</u> 1. No Action 2. Excavation and Off-Site Disposal 3. Excavation, Stabilization (as needed) and On-Site Disposal 4. Containment (capping) 5. Phytoremediation	Excavation, Stabilization (as needed) and On-site Disposal	The selected remedy has been implemented as described in the ROD. The clean-closure removal action at the Transformer Storage Area was accepted as the final action.