



REGION 3

PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

June 20, 2024

Capt. David J. Obermeier
Commanding Officer
U.S. Coast Guard Yard Baltimore
2401 Hawkins Point Road
Baltimore, MD 21226-1797

Dear Capt. David J. Obermeier:

On May 30, 2024, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received the Final 3rd Five-Year Review (FYR) Report for the US Coast Guard Yard Baltimore for concurrence. This review is required by Section 121(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §9621(c), and by 40 CFR §300.430(f)(4)(ii) of the National Contingency Plan, which require that a periodic review be conducted no less often than every five years after the initiation of remedial actions at sites where hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants will remain at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. The Coast Guard, as lead agency, has the responsibility of conducting this FYR and meeting the statutory deadline.

EPA has reviewed this FYR Report in accordance with EPA's Comprehensive FYR Guidance (OSWER No. 9355,7-03B-P, June 2001). Pursuant to this guidance, EPA's role as the final remedy selection authority at an NPL site under the jurisdiction of another Federal agency or department requires that EPA retain final authority to make protectiveness determinations in connection with the site. EPA may either concur with the Federal agency or department's protectiveness determinations or EPA may provide an independent determination. This determination will be entered in the Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) and in our annual report to Congress. In this case, EPA is making an independent determination because EPA does not agree with the Coast Guard's determination on the 2 operable units (OU) subject to this review.

EPA is issuing an independent determination for the remedies at OU 2 (Former Burn Pit) and OU 4 (Reported Bilge Spoils Area) of protective in the short-term because all exposure pathways are under control and no unacceptable risks are occurring. However, in order for the remedy to be protective in the long-term, the Coast Guard needs to complete the following action:

OU 2 – Site 7 Former Burn Pit

Issue: PFAS has been detected in site at both OUs

Recommendation: Complete the SI report and submit to EPA

Due Date: June 2025

Recommendation: Begin the RI scoping

Due Date: January 2026

Issue: PFAS releases at Building 20 may not be fully understood

Recommendation: Coordinate additional sampling within close proximity of Building 20 with EPA. This should focus on surface water, soil, and sediment along the hydrogeologic gradient as well as constructed storm water infrastructure that could potentially convey PFAS residuals into Curtis Creek.

Due Date: October 2024

OU 4 – Site 9 Reported Bilge Spoils Area

Issue: PFAS has been detected in site at both OUs

Recommendation: Complete the SI report and submit to EPA

Due Date: June 2025

Recommendation: Begin the RI scoping

Due Date: January 2026

Furthermore, EPA has evaluated the sitewide Government Performance and Results Act measures and has determined their status as follows:

Environmental Indicators

- Human Health: Insufficient Data
- Groundwater Migration: Insufficient Data

Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use

The facility is not Site-Wide Ready for Anticipated Use but is projected to achieve this goal by September 30, 2035.

The requirement for this five-year review at the U.S. Coast Guard Yard Baltimore was triggered by the last five-year review date of June 25, 2019. The next five-year review will be due June 25, 2029, five years from the planned completion date of this Five-Year Review. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Remedial Project Manager, Ali Arvanaghi at (215) 814-5436 (OR Arvanaghi.ali@epa.gov).

Sincerely,

Paul Leonard, Director
Superfund and Emergency Management Division

cc: Justin Locus (US Coast Guard)
Jenny Herman (Maryland Department of the Environment)