

N60200.AR.008799
NAS CECIL FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING REGULATORY REVIEW AND COMMENT ON DRAFT FEASIBILITY
STUDY FOR MUNITIONS REMOVAL AT OPERABLE UNIT 5 (OU 5) SITE 15 NAS CECIL
FIELD FL
6/22/2012
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Bob Martinez Center
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Rick Scott
Governor

Jennifer Carroll
Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr.
Secretary

June 22, 2012

BRAC PMO SE
Attn: Mr. Art Sanford
4130 Faber Place Drive
Suite 202
North Charleston, SC 29405

RE: Revision 2, Revised Draft Feasibility Study Report for Munitions Removal at Operable Unit 5, Site 15, Blue 10 Ordnance Disposal Area, Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Jacksonville, Florida.

Dear Mr. Sanford:

I have completed my review of the Revision 2, Revised Draft Feasibility Study Report for Munitions Removal at Operable Unit 5, Site 15, Blue 10 Ordnance Disposal Area, Naval Air Station Cecil Field, dated May 2012 (electronic submittal downloaded April 30, 2012), prepared by Tetra Tech NUS, Inc. The report was submitted in a manner that showed how the previous version of the Feasibility Study Report had been revised to reconcile comments made by EPA and the Department (redline/strikeout) on that previous version. I have the following comments on the revised report:

- (1) The intended use of the property is not consistently stated throughout the document. In some parts of the document, the intended use is correctly stated as a wildlife corridor or natural area that would allow for low-intensity recreational use. In other parts, the intended use is incorrectly stated as either low-intensity recreational use or just recreational use. In still other parts the land use is described as light recreational use. Please make the intended use of the property consistent throughout the document.
- (2) Page ES-10, first paragraph, last sentence, the word "lower" is misspelled "loweer".
- (3) Page 4-27, Alternative 3B, last sentence of paragraph, please change the word "backfilling" to "in".

Mr. Art Sanford
Revision 2, Revised Draft FS Report
Operable Unit 5, Site 15
June 22, 2012
Page 2 of 2

- (4) One component of the alternative 2A, 2B, 2C, 3A, 3B and 3C is the conducting of future annual ground surface inspections for and removals of any munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) that might become apparent after the specified removals of the particular remedy are complete. Would that inspection requirement be transferred to the new property owner with the conveyance of the property, or will the Navy conduct those inspections? Also, would the person conducting such inspections be required to have some minimal training in identifying MEC (3R training) or have some expertise in dealing with MEC (UXO Technician)?

If you have any concerns regarding this letter, please contact me at (850) 245-8997.

Sincerely,



David P. Grabka, P.G.
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Programs Section
Bureau of Waste Cleanup

CC: Debbie Vaughn-Wright, EPA Region 4
John Flowe, City of Jacksonville
Rob Simcik, TtNUS, Pittsburgh
Mike Halil, CH2M Hill, Jacksonville
Mike Fitzsimmons, FDEP, Northeast District

KAW

