



SUSANA MARTINEZ
Governor
JOHN A. SANCHEZ
Lieutenant Governor

NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

2905 Rodeo Park Drive East, Building 1
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-6303
Phone (505) 476-6000 Fax (505) 476-6030
www.nmenv.state.nm.us



RYAN FLYNN
Secretary
BUTCH TONGATE
Deputy Secretary

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

March 18, 2015

Mark Patterson
FWDA, BRAC Coordinator
P.O. Box 93
Ravenna, OH 44266

Steve Smith
USACE FWDA Program Manager
CESWF-PEC-EF
819 Taylor Street, Room 3A12
Fort Worth, TX 76102

**RE: DISAPPROVAL
PERMITTEE-INITIATED INTERIM MEASURES WORK PLAN
PARCEL 16
FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY
MCKINLEY COUNTY, NEW MEXICO
EPA ID# NM6213820974
HWB-FWDA-15-002**

Dear Messrs. Patterson and Smith:

The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) has received the *Permittee-Initiated Interim Measures Work Plan, Parcel 16*, (Plan) dated February 10, 2015 for Fort Wingate Depot Activity (Permittee). NMED has reviewed the Plan and hereby issues this disapproval. The Permittee must address the following comments.

Comment(s):

SECTION 2.0 CONTAMINANTS OF POTENTIAL CONCERN AND REMEDIATION GOALS

1. Permittee Statement – Section 2.1 Contaminants of Potential Concern & CSEM, page 2-1, lines, 22-24 and Table 2-1. “[t]he exposure assumptions that describe the residential exposure scenario are the most conservative, and therefore the most protective, of the three types of receptors addressed by the NMED risk assessment guidance (NMED, 2012).”

NMED Comment:

The 2014 NMED Risk Assessment Guidance replaces and supersedes the 2012 NMED Risk Assessment Guidance for Site Investigations and Remediation. The 2014 NMED Risk Assessment Guidance must be used for data assessment and for risk assessments conducted. This comment henceforth is applicable to all sections which reference the 2012 NMED Risk Assessment Guidance. Replace all references within the Plan to reflect the 2014 NMED Risk Assessment Guidance.

SECTION 3.0 REMOVAL ACTIVITIES AT IGLOO BLOCK K

2. Permittee Statement – Section 3.0 Removal Activities at Igloo Block K, page 3-1 lines 34-35. “[i]t is assumed the soil will be disposed as nonhazardous solid waste.”

NMED Comment:

Revise this statement to reflect that waste profiling will determine the waste classification as previously discussed (e.g., waste profiling will determine the status of the impacted soil).

3. Permittee Statement – Section 3.0 Removal Activities at Igloo Block K, page 3-1 lines 37-42. “[d]uring the same time frame as the soil removal, all 200 steel drain pipes from the 100 igloos from Igloo Block B will be cut and removed from the igloos. In preparation for drain pipe removal, plastic sheeting will be placed below each pipe and the piping will be wrapped in tape to prevent any paint coasting from being disturbed. The drain pipes at each igloo will be cut at the wall and the remaining drain holes will be sealed with a cement-based, non-shrink grout. The removed pipe sections will be recycled.”

NMED Comment:

As a precaution removal of these drains must be conducted prior to soil removal to ensure any cuttings are captured. No response necessary.

4. Permittee Statement –Section 3.0, Removal Activities at Igloo Block K, page 3-2, lines 21-24. “[i]f excavation of all lead results to below the SSL of 400 mg/kg is not feasible,

confirmation sample results can be combined to calculate an upper confidence limit (UCL) on the mean for comparison to the SSL, with NMED approval.”

NMED Comment:

The Permittee’s proposed method to calculate UCLs is not clear. If the Permittee uses this method to calculate UCLs as described, then the Permittee must revise the Plan to clarify how samples will be combined. Additionally, explain how combining samples will be representative of site conditions and provide a figure showing the proximity of sample locations. Note that analytical data from soil that has been removed from the site cannot be used in to calculate the UCL; confirmatory soil analytical samples must be used. Revise the Plan to either clarify this method or remove it from within the Plan.

SECTION 4.0 REMOVAL ACTIVITIES AT Z135-4 OPEN STORAGE PAD

5. Permittee Statement – Section 4.1 – Waste Profile Sampling, page 4-1, lines 24-25. “[t]he waste profile composite sample will be collected as a composite with individual surface grab samples from 0 to 0.5 foot depth over the entire area to be excavated.

NMED Comment:

Waste is not generated until the soil has been excavated; therefore, waste profiling cannot be conducted until soil is excavated. In addition, Table 4.1 does not provide information regarding the number of composite samples and where or how they will be collected. Each of the six areas to be excavated varies in depth and constituents of concern. Thus, sampling in-situ may not be representative of the waste generated. The Permittee must propose to collect the composite samples for waste profiling post excavation. Revise the Plan to include a detailed description of the soil excavation, sampling, and waste profiling process.

6. Permittee Statement – Section 4.3 – Confirmation Sampling and Risk Evaluation, page 4-2, lines 18-28. “[f]ollowing the removal of all impacted soil from Z135-4 Open Storage Pad, confirmation sampling will be conducted on the floor and sidewalls of the excavation. The confirmation samples will be analyzed for explosives using EPA Method 8330B. Composite samples will consist of nine-subsamples randomly collected for the excavation area bottom of Z135-4 Open Storage Pad, which will be divided into four sections: Z135-4B1; Z135-4B2; Z135-4B3; and Z135-4B4. One nine-part composite sample will be collected from each section of the excavation grid, for a total of four (4) samples. One discrete sample will be collected from the sidewalls of each section of the excavation grid for a total of eight (8) discrete samples. In addition, six (6) discrete samples will be collected from the perimeter of the removal area, 10 feet from the northwest and southwest boundaries of the removal area. **Figure 4-3** depicts the excavation confirmation sample locations at Z135-4 Open Storage Pad.”

NMED Comment:

Compositing samples for cleanup verification are not accepted without prior NMED prior approval. Compositing may result in the contaminant concentrations that are not representative

of what remains in the soil. If concentrations within the soils are low, compositing may dilute the concentrations of a contaminant to levels less than the method reporting limit. Additionally, if contamination is detected in a composited sample, the location of the contamination remains unknown. Therefore, the Permittee must collect confirmation discrete samples along the limits of excavation (i.e., sidewalls), and from the base of the excavation. Additionally, it is unclear why the Permittee proposes collecting discrete confirmation samples 10 feet from the limits of the excavations. Revise the Plan to include the discrete confirmation sampling along the lateral limits and base of the excavations. Include a detailed description regarding the number of samples to be collected and revise Figure 4-3 to include the additional sample points. Specific information must be included in this Plan regarding the analytical test method(s) utilized for each soil sample collected.

7. Permittee Statement – Section 4.5 Backfill, Compaction, and Final Grading, page 4-4, line 8-9. “[t]he backfill material is anticipated to be obtained from an approved borrow area located on FWDA property.”

NMED Comment:

In an effort to minimize the potential of introducing unacceptable fill material, the Permittee must demonstrate that the fill borrow area is appropriate. The fill material must be analyzed for potential contaminants based on the location and history of the source area. Detectable amounts of compounds of concern within the fill material must be evaluated for risk in accordance with the 2014 NMED Risk Assessment Guidance or approved site-specific soil background data. Revise the Plan to propose to analyze any borrow material before use.

The Permittee must submit a revised Plan to address all comments contained in this Disapproval. In addition, the Permittee must include a response letter that details where each comment was addressed, cross-referencing NMED’s numbered comments. The Permittee must also submit an electronic redline-strikeout version of the revised Plan. The revised Plan must be submitted on or before **May 22, 2015**.

Messrs. Patterson and Smith
March 18, 2015
Page 5

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Vicky Baca at (505) 476-6059.

Sincerely,



John E. Kielling
Chief
Hazardous Waste Bureau

- cc: Dave Cobrain, NMED, HWB
Neelam Dhawan, NMED, HWB
Kristen Vanhorn, NMED, HWB
Chuck Hendrickson, EPA-6PD-N
Tony Perry, Navajo Nation
Val Panteah, Governor, Pueblo of Zuni
Clayton Seoutewa, Southwest Region BIA
Rose Duwyenie, Navajo BIA
Judith Wilson, BIA
Eldine Stevens, BIA
Robin White, BIA

File: FWDA 2015 and Reading
FWDA-15-002

