

N60201.AR.000106  
NS MAYPORT  
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
REGULATION REGARDING DRAFT PHASE 1 RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND  
RECOVERY ACT FACILITY INVESTIGATION REPORT VOLUMES 1 AND 2 NS MAYPORT FL  
10/9/1992  
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

32228-000  
09.01.00.0026



## Florida Department of Environ.

Twin Towers Office Bldg. • 2600 Blair Stone Road • Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Lawton Chiles, Governor

Carol M. Browner, Secretary

October 9, 1992

Mr. Jim Reed  
Code 1855  
Department of the Navy  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Southern Division  
2155 Eagle Drive  
P.O. Box 10068  
Charleston, S.C. 29411-0068

Dear Mr. Reed:

Department personnel have completed the technical review of the Draft RCRA Facility Investigation Phase I, NS Mayport. I have enclosed a memorandum addressed to me from Mr. Mark Canfield. It documents our comments on the referenced report.

If I can be of any further assistance with this matter, please contact me at 904/488-0190.

Sincerely,

Eric S. Nuzie  
Federal Facilities Coordinator

ESN/bb

Enclosure

cc: Brian Cheary  
Lynn Griffin  
John Mitchell  
Cheryl Mitchell  
Jerry Young



State of Florida  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

For Routing To Other Than The Addressee	
To: _____	Location: _____
To: _____	Location: _____
To: _____	Location: _____
From: _____	Date: _____

# Interoffice Memorandum

TO: Eric S. Nuzie, Federal Facilities Coordinator  
Bureau Of Waste Cleanup

THROUGH: James J. Crane, Environmental Administrator *JJC*  
Technical Review Section  
Bureau Of Waste Cleanup

FROM: Mark A. Canfield, Technical Review Section *M.A.C.*  
Bureau of Waste Cleanup

DATE: October 1, 1992

SUBJECT: Draft RCRA Facility Investigation Phase I, Volumes  
I, & II, dated July 1992, U.S. Naval Station  
Mayport, Florida.

After reviewing the above referenced documents, and having reviewed the EPA's comments concerning these documents and also with the understanding that the documents are currently being rewritten to meet the November 1, 1992 (EPA) deadline for the submission of the revised Group I RFI Reports, I have the following comments:

1. The selection of scales for the figures yields an unacceptable level of detail. With the exceptions of Figures 2-6 and 4-9, figures provided cover the entire facility. Larger scaled figures should be provided that are devoted to each SWMU covered in the Phase I Group I investigation.
2. The magnitude and extent of major contaminants identified in this and previous investigations should be plotted for each SWMU.
3. Figure 4-4 indicating the groundwater flow directions for the facility provides valuable information although a Water Table Map, indicating the groundwater flow direction, should be provided for each SWMU.
4. Monitoring well information (diameter, total depth, screened interval) should be provided for all monitoring wells sampled.

MEMORANDUM

Eric Nuzie

October 2, 1992

Page Two

5. Table 4-1 indicating general aquifer characteristics for monitoring wells provides valuable information but characteristics should be determined and averages presented for each SWMU.
6. The FDER concurs with the EPA that the risk assessment section of this report should include both a baseline and current land use scenario for human and ecological exposure levels for each SWMU.