



New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

Site Remediation Program

Report Certifications for RCRA GPRA 2020, CERCLA, and Federal Facility Sites

These certifications are to be used for reports submitted for RCRA GPRA 2020, CERCLA, and Federal Facility Sites. The Department has developed guidance for report certifications for RCRA GPRA 2020, CERCLA, and Federal Facility Sites under traditional oversight. The "Person Responsible for Conducting the Remediation Information and Certification" is required to be submitted with each report. For those sites that are required or opt to use a Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) the report must also be certified by the LSRP using the "Licensed Site Remediation Professional Information and Statement". For additional guidance regarding the requirement for LSRPs at RCRA GPRA 2020, CERCLA and Federal Facility Sites see [http://www.nj.gov/dep/srp/srra/training/matrix/quick\\_ref/rcra\\_cercla\\_fed\\_facility\\_sites.pdf](http://www.nj.gov/dep/srp/srra/training/matrix/quick_ref/rcra_cercla_fed_facility_sites.pdf).

Documents:

- "Response to NJDEP's September 22, 2015 Comments on the June 4, 2015 Request for No Further Action at Parcel 28, Site Investigation Report Addendum, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey."

PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDUCTING THE REMEDIATION INFORMATION AND CERTIFICATION
Full Legal Name of the Person Responsible for Conducting the Remediation: William R. Colvin
Representative First Name: William Representative Last Name: Colvin
Title: Fort Monmouth BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)
Phone Number: (732) 380-7064 Ext: Fax:
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 148
City/Town: Oceanport State: NJ Zip Code: 07757
Email Address: william.r.colvin18.civ@mail.mil
This certification shall be signed by the person responsible for conducting the remediation who is submitting this notification in accordance with Administrative Requirements for the Remediation of Contaminated Sites rule at N.J.A.C. 7:26C-1.5(a).
I certify under penalty of law that I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted herein, including all attached documents, and that based on my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information, to the best of my knowledge, I believe that the submitted information is true, accurate and complete. I am aware that there are significant civil penalties for knowingly submitting false, inaccurate or incomplete information and that I am committing a crime of the fourth degree if I make a written false statement which I do not believe to be true. I am also aware that if I knowingly direct or authorize the violation of any statute, I am personally liable for the penalties.
Signature: [Handwritten Signature] Date: 4/4/2016
Name/Title: William R. Colvin, PMP, CHMM, PG BRAC Environmental Coordinator



## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT  
U.S. ARMY FORT MONMOUTH  
P.O. 148  
OCEANPORT, NEW JERSEY 07757

April 4, 2016

Ms. Linda Range  
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
Bureau of Case Management  
401 East State Street  
PO Box 420/Mail Code 401-05F  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0028

**Subject:** *Response to NJDEP's September 22, 2015 Comments on the June 4, 2015 Request for No Further Action at Parcel 28, Site Investigation Report Addendum, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey*

Dear Ms. Range:

Fort Monmouth and Parsons have reviewed the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) comments on the subject submittal for ECP Parcel 28, as documented in your letter dated September 22, 2015. We appreciate this opportunity to work with you on Parcel 28. Responses to your comments are provided below, for your review and concurrence or further comments.

### **A. Underground Storage Tanks**

**A1. COMMENT:** *The submittal indicates all but two of the reportedly 16 USTs previously located within Parcel 28 have received a designation of NFA. Attachment B, referenced as a compilation of the 16 USTs formerly located within Parcel 28, does not appear to include all UST/potential UST locations as noted on the figure contained in the July 2014 Addendum Environmental Condition of Property Report Unregulated Heating Oil Tank Investigation Report. Two specific USTs not included are:*

*UST Bldg 2546 / T9 – given a designation of Category 1 on February 22, 2013  
UST Bldg 2544 / T7 – for which it was previously determined the NJDEP cannot comment as to the absence or presence of a petroleum discharge as no evaluation has been performed.*

**A1. RESPONSE:** Agreed; there will be no further submittals from the Army concerning these locations.

**A2. COMMENT:** *As regarding the request for designation of NFA for the following two USTs, as initially indicated via email to Calibre's Joe Pearson on June 19, 2013 at 1349 hours, no further action for the following USTs is required.*

*UST 2542-29  
UST 2564-32*

**A2. RESPONSE:** Agreed.

**B. Former Septic System and Septic Tank A**

**B1. COMMENT:** *Although the evaluation as proposed was unable to be fully completed due to the presence of the existing geothermal well field, it is agreed the investigation as documented in the referenced submittal, in conjunction with that previously performed and documented in the 2008 Site Investigation, is sufficient. No further action is necessary at this area of concern/carve-out.*

**B1. RESPONSE:** Agreed.

**C. Former Septic System East of Heliport Drive and South of Radiac Way**

**C1. COMMENT:** *Previous sampling efforts as detailed in the 2008 Site Investigation adequately evaluated the leachfield, and found no contaminants above applicable criteria. The additional characterization sampling as documented in the referenced submittal was performed to complete evaluation of the septic system. Based upon the soil and ground water analytical results, no further action is necessary at this area of concern/carve-out. Although several metals were found in ground water above the Ground Water Quality Standards, N.J.A.C. 7:9-6, it has been determined the levels are present due to naturally occurring background conditions, not as the result of a discharge, and therefore are not subject to remediation pursuant to the Site Remediation Reform Act (N.J.S.A. 58:10C-1 et. seq.).*

**C1. RESPONSE:** Agreed.

**D. Former Septic System at Southeastern Corner of Parcel 28**

**D1. COMMENT:** *As proposed, one test pit was performed in the location of the former holding tank area and four test pits were located within the former leach field. Based upon the additional sampling activities performed, and the analytical results from these as well as the 2008 Site Investigation activities, it is agreed the septic system has been adequately evaluated, and no further action is necessary at this area of concern/carve-out. Although several metals were found in ground water above the Ground Water Quality Standards, N.J.A.C. 7:9-6, it has been determined the levels are present due to naturally occurring background conditions, not as the result of a discharge, and therefore are not subject to remediation pursuant to the Site Remediation Reform Act (N.J.S.A. 58:10C-1 et. seq.).*

**D1. RESPONSE:** Agreed.

**E. Former Gas Station at Former Building 2541**

**E1. COMMENT:** *Although not identified in the 2008 Site Investigation, a gasoline station was subsequently identified as previously operating at Former Building 2541. An investigation of the area was performed in July/August 2013, with no exceedances of the applicable Soil Remediation Standards for volatile organics or lead noted.*

Linda S. Range, NJDEP  
Response to Comments  
Request for No Further Action at Parcel 28  
April 4, 2016  
Page 3 of 3

*Several of the ground water samples, however, exhibited elevated levels of lead, and cannot be considered for designation of no further action needed. As indicated in the submittal, the lead results may be biased high due to the sampling method (sampling collection using a bailer, with high turbidity likely). Based upon the former use of the site, however, at minimum, the location which exhibited the highest lead concentration must be resampled, using methodology that would reduce turbidity (e.g. low flow), to obtain an analytical result which is below the Ground Water Quality Standards (N.J.A.C.).*

**E1. RESPONSE:** Additional groundwater sampling has been performed to further assess the potential for lead impacts to groundwater from the Former Gas Station at Former Building 2541. This additional sampling was described in the November 2015 (Revision 1) version of *Environmental Condition of Property Supplemental Phase II Site Investigation Work Plan for Parcels 28, 38, 39, 49, 57, 61, and 69, Fort Monmouth, Oceanport, Monmouth County, New Jersey*, which is also referred to as the ECP Work Plan. The ECP Work Plan was approved by NJDEP in their letter dated December 30, 2015. Recently (March 2016) one groundwater monitoring well was installed, developed and sampled for lead at the location where the highest detection of lead was found. Results will be reported within a supplemental ECP Phase II Site Investigation (SI) report.

With the previous NJDEP acceptance of Parsons ECP Work Plan, we believe that all parties are in agreement on Parcel 28. The technical Point of Contact (POC) for this matter is Cris Grill at (617) 449-1583 or by email at [cris.grill@parsons.com](mailto:cris.grill@parsons.com). Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me by phone at (732) 380-7064 or by e-mail at [william.r.colvin18.civ@mail.mil](mailto:william.r.colvin18.civ@mail.mil).

Sincerely,



William R. Colvin, PMP, PG, CHMM  
BRAC Environmental Coordinator

cc: Linda Range, NJDEP (e-mail and 3 hard copies)  
Delight Balducci, HQDA ACSIM (e-mail)  
Joseph Pearson, Calibre (e-mail)  
James Moore, USACE (e-mail)  
Jim Kelly, USACE (e-mail)  
Cris Grill, Parsons (e-mail)