



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

SOUTHERN DIVISION

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

2155 EAGLE DR., P. O. BOX 10068

CHARLESTON, S. C. 29411-0068

32501.000
03.05.00.0011

PLEASE ADDRESS REPLY TO THE
COMMANDING OFFICER, NOT TO
THE SIGNER OF THIS LETTER.
REFER TO:

5090/11

Code 18213

26 FEB 1991

N00204.AR.000198

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Ms. Michelle M. Glenn
Environmental Protection Agency
Region IV
Hazardous Waste/Federal Facilities
345 Courtland Street
Atlanta, GA 30365

Dear Ms. Glenn:

Based on letters from EPA: two dated 28 January 1991, and one dated 12 February 1991, and discussions held between the FFA parties on 14 January 1991, 30 January 1991, and 13, 14 February 1991, there is still a lack of understanding between the parties with regards to how and when the Navy shall respond to FFA derived review comments from EPA & FDER. To erase this confusion, the Navy proposes and intends to implement the following:

1. The Navy shall respond to all FFA derived review comments at one time, and as appropriate, provide one single revised document for further consideration.

2. The Navy considers the commencement of its own review and comment period as the date of receipt of the last set of review comments from either party.

The Navy's position is founded in language from Part VIII.G.2 of the FFA and the practicalities of meeting the stated obligations. The Navy is required to "...give full consideration to all written comments ...submitted during the comment period." The basis of Part VIII is to provide for both EPA and FDER to review and comment on Navy generated primary and secondary FFA documents. In order for the Navy to give full consideration of FFA derived review comments, the Navy must first obtain those comments from both parties. This will insure that the Navy's response is coordinated, and that any resulting document revision shall address the full range of concerns as expressed by both parties.

This subject first came to light during the parties review and comment of the Navy's initial submittal of the 1991-1992 Site Management Plan. This matter was discussed at a 27 December 1990 meeting at EPA, Region IV's office in

Atlanta, GA, and at a 4 January 1991, meeting at FDER's Tallahassee, FL office. The result of those discussions was that the time for the Navy's response started when comments from both EPA and FDER were received. To insure that the time between the parties response is kept to a minimum, the Navy intends to keep each party aware of its receipt of the other party's review comments.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call Mr Joel G. Murphy, Code 18213, at (803) 743-0577.

Sincerely ,

J. B. MALONE, JR, P.E.
Manager, IR East

copy to:
NAS Cecil Field
NAS Jacksonville (Code 184IR)
NAS Pensacola