



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-4431**

JUN 05 1995

Mr. Orlando Monaco
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Environmental Contracts Branch
10 Industrial Highway
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Re: Naval Air Warfare Center, Warminster, PA

Dear Mr. Monaco:

This letter provides EPA comments on Proposed Subsurface Boring Locations for Concrete Lagoons as prepared by HNUS and dated May 26, 1995. Most of these comments were discussed by telecon on June 2, 1995.

1. Note that 1) the features appearing on Figure 1 are not be to scale, 2) the center points of each impoundment on Figure 1 have been identified in the field using coordinates provided by EPIC and surveying by the Navy, rather than by aerial photo interpretation, and 3) per observations regarding the identification of coordinates provided by EPIC at other parts of NAWC, that the center points identified in the field may be 10 to 15 feet from the actual center points of the former impoundments.
2. As discussed in the Phase III RI Workplan, the location of the soil borings should be determined in part by the results of the Phase III RI soil gas survey. EPA has not received the results of this soil gas survey for soils underlying the concrete impoundments and, as a result, cannot comment on how these results may affect the location of the subject soil borings. If necessary, EPA will provide additional comments on these locations after receipt of these results.
3. The most significant releases of contaminants within Impoundment 4 and Impoundment 5 (IM 4 and IM 5) may have occurred at the points where liquid wastes were discharged. Per aerial photographs provided by EPIC, the points of discharge for IM 4 and IM 5 were at the midpoint of the western perimeter of these two impoundments. Two additional soil borings should be conducted within both IM 4 and IM 5 at locations likely to be representative of the area of these discharges. Per interpretation of aerial photographs

provided by EPIC, these locations should be as indicated on enclosed Figure A (see additional Soil Borings #6 and #7 for both IM 4 and IM 5).

4. Per an interpretation of aerial photographs, Proposed Boring #4 for both IM 4 and IM 5 appears to be at the very perimeter of, if not outside, the areas of these former impoundments. Data from these points may not be representative of soil under the former impoundments and may only help delineate the boundary of these impoundments. As such, borings at these locations may not be necessary at this time.
5. Per previous correspondence, an aerial photo dated March 23, 1959, indicates a potential spill immediately south of IM 5. Aerial photos from subsequent years indicate stressed vegetation in the area of this potential spill. The approximate area of the potential spill is indicated on the attached Figure A. If possible, a soil boring should be conducted within this area at Soil Boring #8 as indicated on Figure A.
6. Regarding the sample analysis, all collected soil samples should be analyzed for hexavalent chromium.

Should you have any questions or comments regarding the above, please give me a call.

Sincerely,



Darius Ostrauskas
Remedial Project Manager

cc: Kathy Davies
Tom Ames, NAWC
David Kennedy, PADER

Figure A

-enclosure to letter of 6/5/95

Note: Map is not to scale.

--- approximate boundaries of unlined impoundments

 approximate area of potential spill

● additional soil borings

