



# United States Department of the Interior

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

WATER RESOURCES DIVISION

111 Great Valley Parkway  
Malvern, PA 19355

Phone 610-647-9008 FAX 610-647-4594

February 10, 2000

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

RE: Remedial Investigation Report for Area B Groundwater Naval Air Warfare Center Warminster, Pennsylvania

Dear Mr. Monaco:

I reviewed the referenced report by Tetra Tech NUS. My comments on the report are listed below.

- (1) Figures 3-6, 3-7, 3-8. Adding the date(s) of water-level measurements to these figures would save the reader from trying to locate the date(s) in the text.
- (2) P. 3-18 and 4-1. There is and never has been a ground-water mound in Casey Village.
- (3) P. 3-18. The reference USGS, 1998 is listed in the reference section as Sloto and others, 1998.
- (4) Section 4. The fate of wells DG-18, DG-19, DG-20, DG-21, and DG-25 needs to be clarified. P. 4-3 states that these were the wells in which ground-water contamination was found but it does not give the date of the samples. These wells are listed in table 2-1, but only DG-19 is listed in Appendix D. The well-location map (figure 1-2) shows only DG-19 and DG-21, but the site-features map (figure 1-3) shows HN-36(S)/DG-18, HN-03(S)/DG-20, HN-02(S)/DG-21, and HN-37(S)/DG-25. What do these designations mean? Is HN-36(S) really DG-18 or are these two different wells? Appendix B gives analyses for HN-36(S), HN-03(S), HN-02(S), and HN-37(S); are these DG-18, DG-20, DG-21, and DG-25? If they are, please use a consistent set of well numbers. If they are not, why weren't DG-18, DG-20, DG-21, and DG-25 sampled in 1998? This is very confusing and makes it difficult to compare historical and recent data.
- (5) P. 5-8. Many of the contaminants are liquid-phase chemicals.
- (6) References. The two reference lists should be combined into one.
- (7) Appendix A. The drilling logs and monitoring well details make up a significant part of this report, which focuses mainly on contaminants. Most of these are in the Area B Hydrogeologic Report and need not be repeated here. Include only those logs not in the Area B Hydrogeologic Report. If you do elect to keep all of the logs in the report, please separate the DG wells from the HN wells so that they can be easily found.

(8) Appendix B Because this report focuses on contaminants, it might be appropriate to reduce or eliminate Appendix A and include the complete chemical data for Area B in Appendix B. The report talks about trends and therefore should present all of the data. The size of the data tables could be reduced by more effective presentation. Pages of data with values of NA are not necessary and do not add anything to the report.

(9) The conclusions of the report appear to be sound.

If you have any questions, please call me at extension 212.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ronald A. Sloto". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Ronald A. Sloto  
Supervisory Hydrologist