

N60201.AR.000600
NS MAYPORT
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM U S EPA REGION IV REGARDING CORRECTIVE
MEASURES STUDY FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT UNITS 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 22 NS
MAYPORT FL
4/16/2002
U S EPA REGION IV



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 4
ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER
61 FORSYTH STREET
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8960

April 16, 2002

4WD-FFB

Ms. Adrienne Wilson
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
P.O. Box 190010
Charleston, South Carolina 29419-9010

SUBJECT: NAVSTA Mayport, Florida
EPA ID# FL9 170 024 260

Dear Ms. Wilson:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has received and reviewed the following document:

- **Corrective Measures Study for Solid Waste Management Unit Numbers 2, 3, 4, 5 and 22, Naval Station Mayport, Mayport, Florida, Rev. 0 (Tetra Tech NUS, Inc., February 2001)**

Enclosed are EPA's review comments. If you should have any questions, please contact me at (404) 562-8555.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Craig A. Benedikt".

Craig A. Benedikt
Senior Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Branch

Enclosure

cc: Jim Cason, FDEP
Cheryl Mitchell, NAVSTA Mayport

**EPA Comments on
Corrective Measures Study for
Solid Waste Management Unit Numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, and 22
Naval Station Mayport
February 2001**

General Comments

1. Beginning in the Executive Summary the CMS uses “selected remedy” when referring to the “recommended remedy”. In most cases, this terminology is used throughout each of the SWMU discussions. However, some of the SWMU discussions use “recommended” in one paragraph and then use “selected” in the next paragraph. The remedy is “recommended” during the CMS stage of the process, not selected. The appropriate changes should be made throughout the CMS.
2. In the discussions of soil sampling for each of the SWMUs it is hard to reconcile the number of samples described in the text as being collected and the number of samples as shown on the accompanying tables. These tables invariably list more samples than are discussed in the text. These inconsistencies should be resolved. In addition, some explanation should be provided as to why multiple samples which were not duplicate samples were collected at some locations and why, as shown on some of the tables, the subsurface soil samples were always collected on different dates than the surface samples.

Specific Comments

1. **Page 1-2, Figure 1-1.** The box labeled “Naval Station Mayport” on the figure should be moved and the actual location (approximate facility boundary) of the naval station should be shown.
2. **Page 2-18, First Partial Paragraph.** One sentence in this paragraph states “The areal extent of soil contamination was estimated to be 200 x 80 feet (16,000 ft²) as shown on Figure 2-3.” The figure does not appear to present the area of contaminated soil. It does show what appears to be a paved area which, according to the scale on the figure, appears to be approximately 125 x 400 feet. The area of contaminated soil should be shown on the figure.
3. **Page 3-5, First Paragraph.** The third sentence of this paragraph states “Sample locations SS/BS04 through SS/BS08 were located to the south within the main area” Both Table 3-2 and Figure 3-2 identify these sampling locations as BS04 through BS08. This inconsistency should be resolved.

4. **Page 4-1, First Paragraph.** This paragraph states “The landfill consists of two contiguous areas separated by a storm drainage ditch. . . .” Neither the two areas nor the ditch are shown on Figure 4-1. The described areas should be included on the Figure.