

Shaw Environmental, Inc.
312 Directors Drive
Knoxville, TN 37923
865.690.3211
Fax 865.690.3626



November 30, 2009

SHAW-MC-CK11-0454
Project No. 800486

Mr. Lee Coker
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District
Attn: EN-GE/Lee Coker
109 St. Joseph Street
Mobile, Alabama 36602

**Contract: DACA21-96-D-0018, Task Order CK11
Fort McClellan, Alabama**

**Subject: Responses to ADEM Comments on the Final Remedial Investigation Report
for the Bains Gap Road Ranges**

Dear Mr. Coker:

The subject document is provided in both hardcopy and electronic (PDF) versions for your records. We believe the additional information provided in the responses adequately addresses ADEM's outstanding concerns and that no revisions to the final RI report are required. Therefore, the Army is requesting ADEM's concurrence on the Final RI Report for the Bains Gap Road Ranges.

At your request, I have distributed copies of these comment responses according to the attached distribution list. If you have questions, or need further information, please contact me at (865) 694-7361.

Sincerely,

Stephen G. Moran, P.G.
Project Manager

Attachment

Distribution: Lisa Holstein, Army TF (4 hardcopies; 1 CD)
Brandi Little, ADEM (2 hardcopies; 1 CD)
Doyle Brittain, EPA Region 4 (1 hardcopy; 1 CD)
Peter Tuttle, USFWS (1 hardcopy; 1 CD)
Steve Miller, USFWS (1 hardcopy; 1 CD)
Pete Jerome, USFWS (1 hardcopy; 1 CD)
Robin Scott, MDA (1 hardcopy)
Michelle Beekman, Matrix Environmental (1 hardcopy)

November 13, 2009

Mr. Scott Bolton
U. S. Army Transition Force
P. O. Box 5022
Fort McClellan, Alabama 36205

RE: ADEM Review and Comments: Army's Responses to ADEM Evaluations on *Draft Remedial Investigation Report: Bains Gap Road Ranges, Range 24, Parcel 80Q; Range 21, Parcel 77Q; Range 22, Parcel 78Q and Former Mortar Range, Parcel 109Q; Range 27, Parcel 85Q, Volumes I-IV*, dated June 2008
Fort McClellan, Calhoun County, Alabama
Facility I.D. No. AL4 210 020 562

Dear Mr. Bolton:

The Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM or the Department) has reviewed the Army's Responses to ADEM Evaluations on the Draft Remedial Investigation (RI) Report: Bains Gap Road Ranges, Range 24, Parcel 80Q; Range 21, Parcel 77Q; Range 22, Parcel 78Q and Former Mortar Range, Parcel 109Q; Range 27, Parcel 85Q. ADEM evaluations are attached for your review and response. Please note that this evaluation addresses only outstanding issues. Issues that had been addressed in previous Comment-Response evaluations were not considered. The following specific comments are not included because the Army's responses are adequate and the comments have been resolved: 84, 87, 111, and 114.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter please contact Ms. Kaneshia Townsend at 334-394-4356 or via email at ktownsend@adem.state.al.us.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. Cobb, Chief
Governmental Hazardous Waste Branch
Land Division

Enclosure

SAC/TPS/KLT/mal

cc: Mr. Robin Scott/MDA
Ms. Tracy P. Strickland/ADEM
Mr. Lee Coker/USACE, Mobile District

Ms. Brandi Little/ADEM
Mr. Doyle Brittain/EPA Region 4

ATTACHMENT

ADEM Evaluations

Army's Responses to ADEM Evaluations on the Draft Remedial Investigation Report, Bains Gap Road Ranges, Range 24 Upper, Parcel 80Q; Range 21, Parcel 77Q; Range 22, Parcel 78Q and Former Mortar Range, Parcel 109Q; and Range 27, Parcel 85Q
Fort McClellan, Alabama

Specific Comments

Comment 41: Page 4-2, Section 4.1.1. Considering that EPA's current lead concentration in soil that represents a level below which the 95 percentile fetal blood lead concentration would not exceed 10 pg/dL for adult worker exposure is 780 mg/kg, please provide clarification on the differences between the industrial site specific screening levels (SSSL) of 880 mg/kg which is referenced in the Human Health and Ecological Screening Values and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) Background Summary Report as EPA's default value and EPA's current published value. Also please clarify in the text how the recreational SSSL for lead, which is based on a youth, is protective of a child who may be recreating at a site with lead contamination.

Response 41: This comment addresses two separate issues. The first issue concerns the basis of the SSSL for lead in industrial soil. The basis for the reviewer's statement that the current EPA acceptable lead concentration in soil for the adult worker is 780 mg/kg is unclear. The current EPA (2004) Region 9 PRG for industrial soil is 800 mg/kg attributed to a recent analysis of NHANES III. The industrial soil PRG in the EPA (2002) PRG list was 750 mg/kg, attributed to the EPA adult blood lead model. The information provided by EPA in 2002 and 2004 is insufficient to permit further explanation of these computations. The SSSL for lead in industrial soil of 880 mg/kg is read directly from the graph in Figure 1 of the description of the adult blood lead model relating fetal blood lead concentration to the concentration of lead in soil for a heterogeneous population (EPA, 1996). From a practical perspective, there is no significant difference between these three values.

The second issue requests clarification how the SSSL for lead in recreational soil, based on a youth, is protective of a young child recreating on the site. Line 13 of page 4-2 of the RI report mentions the recreational site-use SSSL of 7,600 mg/kg for lead in soil. In fact, the SSSL, which is used only as a screening value, is 400 mg/kg. The value of 7,600 mg/kg is the cleanup level for lead in soil for recreational site use (please see Appendix J of the RI report.

As noted in the Installation-Wide Work Plan, no attempt was made to develop SSSLs for every plausible receptor; rather, site-use was categorized within a limited number of generalizations; e.g., residential, commercial/industrial or recreational, and SSSLs were computed for the most highly exposed receptor in each generalized site-use category. For example, the resident was the only receptor considered under residential site use, the groundskeeper was the only receptor considered under commercial/industrial site use, and the recreational

site user (a youth living nearby) was the only receptor considered under recreational site use. This approach does not mean that no other receptors are plausible. For example, grandchildren may visit a residential site and stay for the summer. Several kinds of workers (other than the groundskeeper), customers and delivery personnel would visit commercial/industrial sites. And adults and children (as well as a youth) might visit a recreational site. Nonetheless, the single receptors chosen for evaluation for each of these scenarios (resident, groundskeeper and youthful recreational site user, respectively) were judged and approved to represent the upper bound on exposure, generally because their exposure frequency is expected to be greater than that for other potential receptors. An SSSL that is sufficiently protective for the most highly exposed individual is also protective for less highly exposed individuals.

References:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2004, *Region 9 PRG Table*, San Francisco, California, October.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2002, *Region 9 PRGs Table*, San Francisco, California, October.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1996, *Recommendations of the Technical Review Workgroup for Lead for an Interim Approach to Assessing Risks Associated with Adult Exposures to Lead in Soil*, Technical Review Workgroup for Lead, December.

ADEM

Evaluation: Response is adequate and comment is resolved.

**Response to
Evaluation:**

As agreed during the October 2007 meeting with ADEM, the SSSL for lead in industrial soil will be revised to 800 mg/kg.

Also as agreed during the October 2007 meeting with ADEM, a young child recreational site user is included as a new receptor. The assumptions and equations for developing the SSSLs for this receptor, as well as cleanup levels for lead, are documented in Appendix J.

ADEM

Evaluation: On December 11-12, 2008, the Army hosted a meeting with ADEM, USEPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and their respective contractors. During that meeting, ADEM suggested a cleanup level of 2,144 mg/kg for a young child recreational site user (0-6 years old) was appropriate for a lead cleanup level, where as the Army developed a cleanup level of 8,623 mg/kg for this potential receptor. The Army stated that the youth receptor (7-17 year old) was the more conservative approach for the trespasser scenario than the child receptor due to the potential time/opportunity for exposure. It was noted that neither of these values would actually be used as cleanup levels since ecological risk-based

remedial goals will be much lower and will drive the cleanup. Therefore, the comment is resolved.

Final Response: During the aforementioned meeting, the question was then raised whether the young child recreational site user scenario was required at all since the youth recreational site user (7-17 years old) was determined by the BCT years ago to be the upper bound on risk for recreational exposures. The group agreed that the young child recreational site user scenario could be excluded from the document provided that the risk assessment was revised to state that the youth recreational site user (7-17 years old) was the upper bound on risk and, as such, any conclusions reached regarding the youth recreational site user would also be applicable to the young child. Young child exposures are assessed under the more conservative residential scenario.

Evaluation of

Final Response: ADEM agrees that at the December 11-12 meeting, the human risk-based cleanup level discussion was set aside since ecological risk-based remedial goals would drive the cleanup at the site. However, ADEM does not agree that the youth recreational site user represents the upper bound on risk and that any conclusions regarding the youth recreational site user would also be applicable to the child recreational user.

ADEM is in the process of updating ARBCA to clarify that for the recreational site use scenario, both the child (0-6 years old) and the youth (7-17 years old) receptors should both be evaluated and the more conservative value would be used as the cleanup level. The update will also clarify that for the unrestricted use scenario, the child, youth and adult receptors should all be evaluated and the more conservative value would be used as the cleanup level.

Confirmation of Evaluation of

Final Response: The FTMC youth recreational site user scenario and the current ARBCA trespasser (and/or recreational) adolescent scenario are essentially identical and are based on the EPA Region 4 Human Health Risk Assessment Bulletins - Supplement to RAGS trespasser scenario. Basing the recreational scenario on a youth instead of a young child reflects lesser opportunity for exposure expected for the young child, as noted by EPA (2003). How much less exposure may be expected for the young child, however, is largely speculative, as are most of the exposure assumptions for the youth. Future risk assessments will consider the exposure assumptions for the young child recommended in the forthcoming revision of the ARBCA guidance.

Reference:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2003, *Recommendations of the Technical Review Workgroup for Lead for an Approach to Assessing Risks Associated with Adult Exposures to Lead in Soil*, Technical Review Workgroup for Lead, Final (December, 1996), EPA-540-R-03-001, January.

Comment 96: Page 6-6 to 6-7, Section 6.1.1.3. Considering that young children are more susceptible to lead exposure, please clarify in the text how the recreational exposure scenario is protective of young children who may be recreating with their parents. The recreational exposure scenario assumes that the recreational user is a 7- to 16-year old.

Response 96: Please see response to Specific Comment 41. The main point of that response is that the recreational site user would be the more heavily exposed receptor. This is based on the assumption that the exposure frequency of a youth is expected to be somewhat greater than that of an adult with adult responsibilities including job, home, and child care.

ADEM

Evaluation: Response is adequate and comment is resolved.

Response to

Evaluation: As agreed during the October 2007 meeting with ADEM, a young child recreational site user is included as a new receptor. The assumptions and equations for developing the SSSLs for this receptor, as well as cleanup levels for lead, are documented in Appendix J.

ADEM

Evaluation: On December 11-12, 2008, the Army hosted a meeting with ADEM, USEPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and their respective contractors. During that meeting, ADEM suggested a cleanup level of 2,144 mg/kg for a young child recreational site user (0-6 years old) was appropriate for a lead cleanup level, where as the Army developed a cleanup level of 8,623 mg/kg for this potential receptor. The Army stated that the youth receptor (7-17 year old) was the more conservative approach for the trespasser scenario than the child receptor due to the potential time/opportunity for exposure. It was noted that neither of these values would actually be used as cleanup levels since ecological risk-based remedial goals will be much lower and will drive the cleanup. Therefore, the comment is resolved.

Final Response: Please see response to evaluation for Comment 41 above.

Evaluation of

Final Response: *Please see the Evaluation of the Response to Evaluation of Comment 41 above.*

Confirmation of

Evaluation of

Final Response: Please see Confirmation of Evaluation of Final Response to Comment 41 above.

Comment 112: Page 6-25, Section 6.2.1.4. The use of 1.49 as the target HI is not appropriate for calculating SSSLs. For each route of exposure, the site-wide HI must be less than or equal to 1.0. Furthermore, the use of 1.49 is inconsistent with the target HI presented in the SSSL Report of 1.00 E+00. Please revise the risk assessment for all ranges accordingly.

Response 112: A target HI of 1, not 1.49, was used to calculate SSSLs. However, a target HI of 1.49 was used to calculate cleanup levels from the SSSLs because the cumulative HI for a given mechanism of toxicity (with target organ or target tissue as a surrogate for mechanism of toxicity), rounded to one significant figure, would not exceed the threshold of 1. Nonetheless, as requested by the reviewer, a target organ HI of 1 will be used to revise the calculated cleanup levels.

ADEM

Evaluation: Response is adequate and comment is resolved. Please revise the text accordingly.

Response to

Evaluation: A target HI of 0.1, not 1.49, was used to calculate SSSLs. Please see Response to Evaluation of Specific Comment 111 regarding calculating RGOs instead of cleanup levels.

ADEM

Evaluation: Please see response to Comment 111. The SSSL for noncancer compounds should be calculated based on a HI of 1.0 (not 1.49). Please revise for accuracy to the second significant digit for the HI values.

Final Response: Agreed.

Evaluation of

Final Response: ADEM notes that the previous response states that a value of 1 will be used, which has been used to reflect a numerical value of 1.49 in the text. Please use a target Hazard Index (HI) of 1.0 for cleanup levels or Remedial Goal Objectives (RGOs).

**Confirmation of
Evaluation of**

Final Response: The noncancer-based RGOs presented in the final RI report were calculated from an HI of 1.0.