

N60200.AR.003795
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL
5090.3a

EMAIL REGARDING U S EPA REGION IV COMMENTS ON DRAFT RECORD OF DECISION
FOR OPERABLE UNIT 11 (OU 11) SITE 32 NAS CECIL FIELD FL
12/30/2003
U S EPA REGION IV

Jonnet, Mark

From: Speranza, Mark
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2003 10:48 AM
To: Miller, Ralinda; Dutka, Gary; Glorieux, Jean-Luc; Jonnet, Mark; Simcik, Robert; Logan, Joe
Subject: FW: OU 11, Site 32 Draft ROD

-----Original Message-----

From: Vaughn-Wright.Debbie@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Vaughn-Wright.Debbie@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2003 10:06 AM
To: mark.e.davidson@navy.mil; Grabka, David; Speranza, Mark; MeyersJG@efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil; Michael Halil
Cc: Simcik, Robert; Dutka, Gary; Brock.Martha@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: OU 11, Site 32 Draft ROD

All,

Two things: a few comments from EPA HQ's and latest draft final sent by Gary Dutka , 12/19/03 (TTNUS).

The Region sent comments on this ROD October 8, 2003. Just went over the latest draft sent out by TTNUS and the November BCT meeting minutes. It looks like all of EPA's comments and suggested changes have been made.

Now for the second item. EPA headquarters has reviewed the December 2003 version sent out by TTNUS. They focused their review on the LUC portion of the remedy but the reviewers noticed a few other points as well. Overall, EPA HQ's thought our RODs were good.

1. Section 1.2, The Statement of Basis and Purpose does not contain any statement regarding the State's position. Older RODs did contain a statement that the State concurs with the selected remedy. In recent RODs this statement was removed per David's request. Per EPA Guidance on how to prepare a ROD, Section 1.2, this section should specify whether the State concurs or does not concur with the selected remedy. This is standard language which goes into all RODs nationwide. David - please double check with your management why they did not like this statement. A simple statement as to whether the State is in concurrence/agreement/approves with the ROD or not should be included.

2. Section 1.4, Description of the Selected Remedy, 3rd sentence. Is it accurate to simply say prevent residential use? Should we also include elementary and secondary schools, child care facilities and playgrounds? Does the State of Florida's definition for residential use include schools and child-care facilities? Or do they fall under commercial/industrial? I realize that this distinction has not been made in our earlier RODs, but it is a good distinction to consider since many industries now have child-care facilities on their premises for employees. It has been noted that this distinction is being made in Federal Facility RODs from other Regions. Same question applies to the 1st bullet in Section 2.10.2.

3. Last paragraph of Section 1.4. What is currently in the draft final ROD is consistent with the Site 45 ROD, however, a suggestion was provided that we add a reference to the "2003 Navy Principles" on Land Use Controls at the end of the sentence.

Happy New Year,
Debbie Vaughn-Wright
Environmental Scientist
US EPA, Region 4
61 Forsyth Street

Atlanta, GA 30303
404/562-8539
404/562-8518 (fax)

vaughn-wright.debbie@epa.gov