

N60200.AR.002995
NAS CECIL FIELD, FL
5090.3a

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL AND FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION COMMENTS ON DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT FOR SITE 45 STEAM
GENERATING PLANT NAS CECIL FIELD FL
6/27/2001
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



Jeb Bush
Governor

Department of Environmental Protection

Twin Towers Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

David B. Struhs
Secretary

June 27, 2001

Commanding Officer
Mr. Mark Davidson, Code 1879
SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM
Post Office Box 190010
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

RE: Draft Feasibility Study Report for Site 45 - Steam Generating Plant, Former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Florida.

Dear Mr. Davidson:

The Department has completed its review of the Draft Feasibility Study Report for Site 45 - Steam Generating Plant, Former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, dated January 2001 (received January 16, 2001), prepared and submitted by Tetra Tech NUS, Inc. I have attached a memorandum from Greg Brown, P.E., with comments that should be considered in addressing the site.

If you have any concerns regarding this letter, please contact me at (850) 488-3693.

Sincerely,

David P. Grabka
Remedial Project Manager

CC: Satish Kastury, FDEP
Ashwin Patel, FDEP Northeast District
Debbie Vaughn-Wright, USEPA - Atlanta
John Flowe, City of Jacksonville
Scott Glass, SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM
Mark Speranza, TTNUS - Pittsburgh
Sam Ross, CH2M Hill Constructors, Atlanta

TJB B JJC JJC ESN ESN

Memorandum

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

TO: David P. Grabka, Remedial Project Manager, Technical Review Section

THROUGH: Tim Bahr, P.G., Supervisor, Technical Review Section **B**

FROM: Greg Brown, P.E., Professional Engineer II, **MB**
Technical Review Section

DATE: June 27, 2001

SUBJECT: Draft Feasibility Study Report for Site 45 - Steam Generating Plant, Former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida

I reviewed the subject engineering document dated January 2001 (received January 16, 2001). The subject engineering document provides a reasonable range of alternatives and is generally adequate for its intent. I have the following minor comments:

1. Final engineering documents submitted to the public record should be signed and sealed by the professional engineer with responsible charge.
2. Page ES-2, Section E.3, SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS; The second paragraph states, "The PRE indicated that, although concentrations of vanadium detected in the groundwater were below the risk-based GCTL, exposure to contaminated groundwater could still result in adverse health effects under an hypothetical future residential scenario." What were the exposure assumptions of the "risk-based GCTL?"
3. Page 1-7, Section 1.1.4.3, Contaminant Fate and Transport; provide a summary of the site aquifer's properties and groundwater hydrology such as permeability, porosity, transmissivity, groundwater horizontal and vertical gradients, groundwater flow directions, depth to groundwater, and other relevant characteristics readily available from prior investigations.
4. Summary of Treatability Testing Options; the Cecil Team should fully consider the uncertainties, benefits, and costs of additional treatability studies given their estimated cost of \$470,000 competes with the Feasibility Study's most expensive alternative of \$601,000.

If you have any questions, please call me at (850) 488-3935.

"Protect, Conserve and Manage Florida's Environment and Natural Resources"