

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF  
INSTALLATION RESTORATION MEETING  
19 NOVEMBER 1001

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
0900 - 0930	Orientation	Building 1754
0930 - 1230	Tour Of IR Sites	
1230 - 1330	Lunch	Officer's Club
1330 - 1430	Out-brief	624 MIC

Attendees: Mr. Dick Helmer            House Appropriations  
            Mr. Bob Hammond         Committee Staff  
  
            Mr. James Malone         SOUTHDIV

Purpose: To gather information on the operation of  
Environmental Restoration Programs in the  
Department of Defense.

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SURVEYS AND  
INVESTIGATIONS STAFF  
QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES  
NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA

1. How is the installation organized to carry out its responsibilities for the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) and for other environmental responsibilities, such as compliance?

The MAS Pensacola complex has a Environmental Compliance Board comprised of the Commanding Officer from each of the six major commands and is used to coordinate environmental compliance efforts.

The Naval Aviation Depot, Naval Public Works Center, Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office and the Naval Supply Center each have an environmental office.

The Naval Air Station has an Environmental Special Assistant who develops environmental policy and ensures compliance with State, Federal and Navy regulations through the use of Environmental Compliance Evaluations.

The Facilities Management Office of the Naval Air Station is staffed with two environmental engineers, one engineering technician and a forester (who is funded through SOUTHDIV). One of the environmental engineers is staffed specifically to manage the Installation Restoration Program.

2. What policies does the installation follow for managing its environmental restoration and compliance programs?

NAS Pensacola bases its environmental compliance policies on OPMVA Instruction 5090.1A and applicable federal, state and local environmental laws and regulations. The environmental restoration program uses these as well as the Federal Facilities Agreement which was signed by the Navy, the Environmental Protection Agency and Florida Department of Environmental Regulation.

3. Is the installation adequately staffed to carry out its environmental responsibilities?

No. Projected workload in conjunction with newly enacted and proposed state and federal regulations requires additional personnel to insure environmental compliance.

4. How many contaminated sites are there on the installation and in the DERP?

There are 42 Potential Sources of Contamination (PSC) which have been identified at NAS Pensacola. Of these 42 sites, 17 are undergoing screening and 20 require RI/FS as identified in the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA). The 5 remaining sites have been transferred to the Underground Storage Tank Program.

5. How does the installation define site and where does that definition come from?

Sites were identified during the Initial Assessment Study (IAS), the Verification Study (VS) 1984, Confirmation Study (CS) 1985-86, the RCBA Facility Assessment (RFA) 1987, and RCBA Facility Investigation Study (RFI) 1988. Sites 38 and 39 were identified in further investigations by NAS Pensacola.

6. When was the site(s) included in DERP?

Site 1 - Sanitary Landfill	June 1983
Site 2 - Waterfront Sediments	June 1983
Site 3 - Crash Crew Training Area	June 1983
Site 4 - Army Rubble Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 5 - Borrow Pit	June 1983
Site 6 - Fort Redoubt Rubble Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 7 - Firefighting School	June 1983
Site 8 - Rifle Range Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 9 - Navy Yard Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 10 - Commodore's Pond	June 1983
Site 11 - N. Chevalier Field Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 12 - Scrap Bins	June 1983
Site 13 - Magazine Point Rubble Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 14 - Dredge Spoil Fill	June 1983
Site 15 - Pesticide Rinsate Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 16 - Brush Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 17 - Transformer Storage Yard	June 1983
Site 18 - PCB Spill at Substation 'A'	June 1983
Site 19 - Fuel Farm Pipeline Leak	June 1983
Site 20 - Boarthing Pier Pipeline Leak	June 1983
Site 21 - Sludge Disposal At Fuel Tank Area	June 1983
Site 22 - Refueler Repair Shop Fuel Disposal Site	June 1983
Site 23 - Chevalier Field Pipeline Leaks	June 1983
Site 24 - DDT Mixing Area	June 1983
Site 25 - Radium Spill Site	June 1983
Site 26 - Supply Department Outside Storage	June 1983
Site 27 - Radium Dial Shop Sanitary Sewer	June 1983
Site 28 - Transformer Accident	June 1983

Site 29 - Soil South Of Building 3460	June 1983
Site 30 - Buildings 649/755	July 1984
Site 31 - Soil North Of Building 648	July 1984
Site 32 - IWTP Sludge Drying Bed	July 1984
Site 33 - WWTP Ponds	July 1984
Site 34 - Solvent North Of Building 3557	July 1984
Site 35 - Miscellaneous IWTP SWMUs	January 1987
Site 36 - Industrial Waste Sewer Line	June 1988
Site 37 - Sherman Field Fuel Farm	June 1988
Site 38 - Building 71	July 1990
Site 39 - Oakgrove Campground Site	July 1990
Site 40 - Bayou Grande	July 1990
Site 41 - NAS Pensacola Wetlands	July 1990
Site 42 - Pensacola Bay	July 1990

7. When was the installation put on EPA's National Priorities List (if applicable)?

December 1989.

8. Has inclusion on the NPL expedited or hindered actual cleanup of the contaminated site(s)?

It has expedited the program because it has provided funding that would not have otherwise been available.

9. How is the installation's relationship with EPA and what oversight or monitoring does it provide?

The EPA entered into a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) with the Department of the Navy and the State Environmental Regulatory Agency (Florida Department Of Environmental Regulation (FDER)) on October 23, 1990. Monitoring and oversight of the program is accomplished by review and comment on proposed workplans, oversight of field operations and participation in Technical Review Committee and Project Managers meetings.

10. How is the installation's relationship with the State environmental agency and what oversight or monitoring does it provide?

The same participation as EPA.

34000

11. What oversight or monitoring of the installation's environmental restoration or compliance is done by its major command (identify major command)?

The Major Claimant for NAS Pensacola is CNET who is sent a report each year describing the expenditure of DERA funds for that fiscal year. CNET is also kept informed of major developments in the IR Program.

12. What, environmental management and financial management information systems does the installation use and for what purposes are they used?

Baseline Assessment Memorandum (BAM), Defense Environmental Status Report/Defense Environmental Restoration Program Management Information System (DERS/DERPMIS), Site Management Plan (SMP), Execution Plan, Contract Status Report, A-106 Report, Pollution Control Reports (PCR), Defense Priority-Model (DPM) and Cost Of Remedial Action (CORA).

13. How useful are the following to the installation:

A. The DERP Management Information System?

This tool is used by Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment, Safety, Health and Energy for program management and oversight. It is also used for the annual report to Congress, responding to Congressional inquiries and for budget development purposes.

B. The A-106 Reporting System?

This report is provided to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in September and focuses on project which should be funded in the following fiscal year. It also documents Justification and financial status for funding.

C. The Defense Priority Model?

This is a computer model which computes a numerical score representing relative risk to human health and the environment based on contaminant pathways, hazards and receptors. It also establishes priority for funding based on the highest score.

2000

14. Does the installation have any rapid and safe cleanup plans to expedite disposal of the property (If the installation is on the base closure lists)?

This is not applicable since NAS Pensacola is not included on a base closure list.

15. Is the installation identifying, funding and correcting all Class I compliance problems?? If not, why not (explain)?

Yes. All Class I compliance problems have been identified and Pollution Control Reports (PCRs) have been submitted. All Priority I sites using DERA funds are programed and funded for the IR Program based on the executive plan provided through the EFDs.

16. IS the installation obligating and spending all of its environmental restoration and compliance funds for these purposes? If not, why not (explain)?

Yes. We are obligating and spending all environmental restoration and compliance funds as specified by OPNAVINST 5090.1, Installation Restoration Manual and any other appropriate DOD guidance on funding requirements.

17. What controls are in place to ensure that environmental restoration and compliance funds are spent for these purposes?

Policy requirements, instructions for funds, OPNAVINST 5090.1, IB Manual 2275 and yearly reports of DERA expenditures to NAS Pensacola's Major Claimant, CNET.

18. How does the installation oversee and monitor contractor performance?

The EFD (SOUTHDIV) contracts A/E services and NAS Pensacola provides day to day oversight of field activities. Communication between SOUTHDIV, NAS Pensacola and the contractor is continuous.

19. Are the contractors performing environmental restoration and compliance work at the installation doing a good job and providing the services and quality products they are paid to do?

Yes. The contractor's performance is extremely good.

20. Have there been any major problems with the contractors or their performance? If so, identify the contractor(s) and the problems.

No. The present contractor has not developed any problems as it pertains to their performance.

21. What input does the installation have into the decisions regarding how much has to be cleaned up and at what cost?

The Installation, along with the other Project Managers (SOUTH DIV, Environmental Protection Agency, Florida Department of Environmental Regulation, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Florida Department of Natural Resources and the Northwest Florida Water Management District) act as a group when arriving at such decisions.

#### INFORMATION

1. Provide a listing showing each site with a general description of its size, contamination, when it was identified and included in the DERP, how much of the site has actually been cleaned up, the cleanup cost, when cleanup will be completed and the estimated cost?

#### Site 1 - Sanitary Landfill

Size: Approximately 80 Acres

Waste Of Concern: Ammonia, Phenol, Cyanide, Paint and Plating Wastes, Waste Waters Containing Pesticides, PCB Contaminated Rags And Equipment And Asbestos Insulation Materials.

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	1198,192	Completed
RI/FS	8350,337	ECD 6/94
RD	8156,000	ECD 9/94
RA	82,444,000	ECD 12/99

#### Site 2 - Waterfront Sediments

Size: Approximately 30 Acres

Waste Of Concern: Paints, Thinners, Paint Strippers, Paint Chips, Ketones, Solvents And Metal Plating Chemicals (Chromium, Cadmium, Lead Nickel And Cyanide)

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	6198,192	Completed
RI/FS	8350,337	ECD 6/94
RD	1130,000	ECD 9/97
RA	1470,000	ECD 12/99

1/20/99

Site 3 - Crash Crew Training Area

Size: Approximately 10 Acres

Waste Of Concern: Lube Oil, Jet and Aviation Fuels

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	8198,192	Completed
RI/FS	\$334,893	ECD 6/94
RD	86,000	ECD 9/97
RA	194,000	ECD 12/99

Site 4 - Army Rubble Disposal Site

Size: Approximately 150' x 800'

Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	\$198,192	Completed
RI/FS	\$449,537	ECD 6/94
RD	\$25,000	ECD 9/97
RA	\$360,000	ECD 12/99

Site 5 - Borrow Pit

Size: Approximately 650' x 800'

Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	\$198,192	Completed
RI/FS	4449,537	ECD 6/94
RD	825,000	ECD 9/97
RA	1360,000	ECD 12/99

Site 6 - Fort Redoubt Rubble Disposal

Size: Approximately 450' x 1650'

Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes, Asbestos

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	\$198,192	Completed
RI/FS	8449,537	ECD 6/94
RD	530,000	ECD 9/97
RA	847,000	ECD 12/99

Site 7 - Firefighting School

Size: Approximately 200' x 200'

Waste Of Concern: Petroleum Products

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	8198,192	Completed
RI/FS	8332,056	ECD 6/94
RD	\$30,000	ECD 9/97
RA	\$47,000	ECD 12/99

Site 8 - Rifle Range Disposal Site

Size: Approximately 165' x 550'  
Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 8198,192 Completed  
RI/FS \$140,608 ECD 6/94  
RD 66,000 ECD 9/97  
RA 890,000 ECD 12/99

Site 9 - Navy Yard Disposal Site

Size: Approximately 600' x 800'  
Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 1198,192 Completed  
RI/FS \$334,893 ECD 6/94  
RD 1250,000 ECD 9/97  
RA 83,963.750 ECD 12/99

Site 10 - Commodore's Pond

Size: Approximately 250' x 500'  
Waste Of Concern: Ship Timbers  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI \$86,322 Completed  
RI/FS \$322,856 ECD 6/94  
RD 10  
RA 80

Site 11 - North Chevalier Field Disposal

Size: Approximately 18 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Waste Oil, Plating Wastes, Metals  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 5198,192 Completed  
RI/FS 8450,337 ECD 6/94  
RD 1228,000 ECD 9/97  
RA \$3,572,000 ECD 12/99

Site 12 - Scrap Bins

Size: Approximately 250' x 1200'  
Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI \$86,322 Completed  
RI/FS \$338,300 ECD 12/93  
RD \$0  
RA \$0

010000

Site 13 - Magazine Point Rubble Disposal

Size: Approximately 56 acres  
Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes  
Included In DEBP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 586,322 Completed  
RI/FS 8358,300 ECD 12/93  
RD 10  
RA #0

Site 14 - Dredge Spoil Fill

Size: Approximately 2100' x 2400'  
Waste Of Concern: Contaminated Sediments From Pensacola Bay  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 586,322 Completed  
RI/FS 1338,300 ECD 12/93  
RD CO  
RA SO

Site 15 - Pesticide Rinsate Disposal Site

Size: Approximately 100' x 300'  
Waste Of Concern: Organic Phosphates, Chlorinated  
Hydrocarbons, Carbaryl And Carbamates.  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI #198,192 Completed  
RI/FS 6350,337 ECD 6/94  
RD #15,000 ECD 9/97  
RA #213,000 ECD 12/99

Site 16 - Brush Disposal Site

Size: Approximately 30 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Solid Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costa: PA/SI 186,332 Completed  
RI/FS #449,537 ECD 12/93  
RD #0  
RA #0

Site 17 - Transformer Storage Yard

Size: Approximately 50' x 200'  
Waste Of Concern: PCBs  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 8198,192 Completed  
RI/FS #449,537 ECD 6/94  
RD #12,000 ECD 9/97  
RA 2210,000 ECD 12/99

Site 18 - PCB Spill At Substation 'A'

Size: Approximately 50' x 75'

Waste Of Concern: PCBs

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	8198,192	Completed
RI/FS	8449,537	ECD 6/94
RD	815,000	ECD 9/97
RA	8230,000	ECD 12/99

Site 19 - Fuel Farm Pipeline Leak

Transferred To Underground Storage Tank Program In 1990.

Costs: PA/SI	8198,192	Completed
RI/FS	\$206,322	
RD	80	
RA	80	

Site 20 - Berthing Pier Pipeline Leak

Transferred To Underground Storage Tank Program In 1990.

Costs: PA/SI	8198,192	Completed
RI/FS	8194,285	
RD	SO	
RA	10	

Site 21 - Sludge Disposal At Fuel Tank

Transferred To Underground Storage Tank Program In 1991.

Costs: PA/SI	\$198,192	Completed
RI/FS	\$194,285	
RD	\$0	
RA	10	

Site 22 - Refueler Repair Shop Fuel Disposal Site

Size: Approximately 300' x 450'

Waste Of Concern: Leaded Fuel

Included In DERP: 1983

Costs: PA/SI	\$198,192	Completed
RI/FS	\$449,537	ECD 6/94
RD	815,000	ECD 9/97
RA	8230,000	ECD 12/99

Site 23 - Chevalier Field Pipeline Leaks

Transferred To Underground Storage Tank Program In 1991.

Costs: PA/SI	\$198,192	Completed
Future Costs:	\$2,906,598	
Cost To Complete:	\$3,104,790	

Site 24 - DDT Mixing Area

Size: Approximately 400' x 600'  
Waste Of Concern: DDT And Petroleum Products  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 1198,192 Completed  
RI/FS 9338,300 ECD 6/94  
RD #6,000 ECD 9/97  
RA #94,000 ECD 12/99

Site 25 - Radium Spill Site

Size: Approximately 250' x 250'  
Waste Of Concern: Waste Radium Paint  
Included In DEFU?: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 5198,192 Completed  
RI/FS 5443,856 ECD 6/94  
RD #6,000 ECD 9/97  
RA 994,000 ECD 12/99

Site 26 - Supply Department Outside Storage

Size: Approximately 100' x 200'  
Waste Of Concern: Industrial Chemicals  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI #198,192 Completed  
RI/FS 8350,337 ECD 6/94  
RD #12,000 ECD 9/97  
BA #220,000 ECD 12/99

Site 27 - Dial Shop Sanitary Sewer

Size: Approximately 75' x 350'  
Waste Of Concern: Radium Paint Waste  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI #198,192 Completed  
RI/FS 9334,803 ECD 6/94  
RD #141,000 ECD 9/94  
RA #2,209,000 ECD 12/99

Site 28 - Transformer Accident

Size: Approximately 175' x 400'  
Waste Of Concern: PCBs  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI #198,192 Completed  
RI/FS r1334.893 ECD 6/94  
RD #12,000 ECD 9/94  
RA 195.000 ECD 12/99

215000

Site 29 - Soil South Of Building 3460

Size: Approximately 275' x 425'  
Waste Of Concern: Industrial Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1983  
Costs: PA/SI 8198,192 Completed  
RI/FS 8334,893 ECD 6/94  
RD 8250,000 ECD 9/94  
BA 83,963,750 ECD 12/99

Site 30 - Building 649/755

Size: Approximately 15 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Plating Shop Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1984  
Costs: PA/SI 8174,710 Completed  
RI/FS #350,337 ECD 6/94  
RD 827,000 ECD 9/94  
RA #430,000 ECD 12/99

Site 31 - Soil North Of Building 648

Size: Approximately 150' x 250'  
Waste Of Concern: Paints And Thinners  
Included In DERP: 1984  
Costs: PA/SI 8174,710 Completed  
RI/FS 8334,893 ECD 6/94  
RD 8141,000 ECD 9/94  
RA 82,209,000 ECD 12/99

Site 33 - Industrial Sludge Drying Beds

Size: Approximately 26 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Industrial Sludge, VOCs And Heavy Metals  
Included In DEBP: 1984, Site Has Undergone BCRA Closure  
Costs: PA/SI 8313,710 Completed  
RI/FS 8633,330 ECD 6/93  
BD #0  
BA 8414,000 ECD 6/95

Site 33 - Wastewater Treatment Plant Ponds

Size: Approximately 36 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Industrial Sludge, VOCs And Heavy Metals.  
Included In DERP: 1984, Site Has Undergone RCRA Closure  
Costs: PA/SI 8313,710 Completed  
RI/FS #633,333 ECD 6/93  
RD 80  
EA 8114,000 ECD 6/95

Site 34 - Solvent North Of Building 3557

Size: Approximately 200' x 200'

Waste Of Concern: Chlorinated Aromatic Hydrocarbons  
Included In DERP: 1984

Costs: PA/SI	8174,710	Completed
RI/FS	\$334,893	ECD 6/94
RD	\$250,000	ECD 9/94
BA	83,963,750	ECD 12/99

Site 35 - Miscellaneous IWTP SMU's

Size: Approximately 26 Acres

Waste Of Concern: Industrial Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1987

Costs: PA/SI	\$174,710	Completed
RI/FS	8633,333	ECD 6/94
RD	8150,000	ECD 9/94
BA	8235,000	ECD 12/99

Site 36 - Industrial Waste Sewer Line

Size: Approximately 4 Miles In Length

Waste Of Concern: Industrial Wastes  
Included In DERP: 1988

Costs: PA/SI	8174,710	Completed
RI/FS	8322,856	ECD 6/94
RD	\$220,000	ECD 9/97
BA	\$320,000	ECD 12/99

Site 37 - Sherman Field Fuel Farm

Transferred To The Underground Storage Tank Program In 1990.  
Partial Cleanup Has Taken Place. Pilot Remediation Project  
Has Been Installed.

Costs: PA/SI	162,840	Completed
Future Costs:	15,406	
Cost To Complete:	\$68,246	

Site 38 - Building 71

Size: Approximately 300' x 300'

Waste Of Concern: Paints, Ketones, Trichloroethylene  
Included In DERP: 1990

Costs: RI/FS	1449,537	ECD 12/95
RD	\$0	
RA	80	

815000

Site 39 - Oak Grove Campground Site

Size: Approximately 150' x 150'  
Waste Of Concern: Petroleum  
Included In DERP: 1990  
Costs: RI/FS 1437,500 ECD 12/95  
RD #0  
RA #0

Site 40 - Bayou Grande

Size: Approximately 50 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Contaminated Surface Waters Runoff  
Included In DERP: 1990  
Costs: RI/FS 81,500,000 ECD 12/95  
RD #0  
RA #0

Site 41 - Naval Air Station Pensacola Wetlands

Size: Approximately 100 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Migrating Contaminants  
Included In DERP: 1990  
Costs: RI/FS 81,500,000 ECD 12/95  
RD (10  
RA #0

Site 42 - Pennacola Bay Area

Size: Approximately 100 Acres  
Waste Of Concern: Migrating Contaminants  
Included In DERP: 1990  
Costs: RI/FS (11,500,000 ECD 12/95  
RD #0  
RA (10

2. Provide for each site the beginning date, completion date, the cost and the name of the contractor(s) for all of the Preliminary Assessment, Site Inspection, Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study, Remedial Design and Remedial Action.

Sites 1 through 29

PA Started: 18 January 1982

PA Completed: June 1983

Cost: 8 65,000

Contractor: Naval Energy and Environmental Support  
Activity (NEESA) Port Hueneme, California

010000

Sites 1,2,3,9,11,15,17,22,23,26,27,29,30,31,32,33,34

SI Started: January 1984

SI Completed: July 26, 1984

Cost: \$ 521,000

Contractor: Geraghty & Miller Inc.

Ground Water Consultants

13902 North Dale Mabry Hwy, Suite 100

Tampa, Florida 33618

Sites 1,11,15,19,26,32,33

ESI Started: June 1985

ESI Completed: March 1986

Cost: \$ 296,000

Contractor: Geraghty & Miller Inc.

Sites 1,2,11,12,13,14,15,24,26,30

RI/FS Workplans (Phases I & II)

Start Date: October 23, 1990

Completion Date: March 10, 1994 (includes Baseline Risk  
Assessment)

Cost: FY 90 \$1,383,000

Contractor: Ecology & Environment Inc.

316 South Baylen Street

Pensacola, Florida 32501

Sites 3,7,9,10,19,20,21,23,25,27,29,31,34,36

RI/FS Workplans (Phases I & II)

Start Date: October 23, 1990

Completion Date: September 9, 1994 (includes Baseline Risk  
Assessment)

Cast: FY 89 \$162,500.00

FY 91 \$2,476,133.24 (obligated)

Contractor: Ecology & Environment Inc.

Sites 32,33,35

RI/FS Workplans (Phases I & II)

Start Date: June 15,1991

Completion Date: December 17, 1993 (includes Baseline Risk  
Assessment)

Cost: FY 86 \$234,000.00

Contractor: Ecology & Environment Inc.

Sites 4,5,6,8,16,17,18,22,28,38,39  
 RI/FS Workplans (Phases I & II)  
 Start Date: September 15,1991  
 Completion Date: ~~May~~ 8,1994 (includes Baseline Risk  
 Assessment)  
 Cost: FY 89 \$162,500.00  
 FY 91 \$176,866.66 (obligated)  
 Contractor: Ecology & Environment Inc.

Sites 40,41,42  
 RI/FS Workplans (Phases I & II)  
 Start Date: December 15,1992  
 Completion Date: August 9,1995  
 Cost: FY 92 \$1,500,000.00 (planned)  
 Contractor: Engsafe / Allen & Hoshall  
 5724 Summer Trees Drive  
 P.O. Box 341315  
 Memphis, Ten 38184-1315  
 Phone: (901) 372-7962

3. Provide a listing of all funds required, received, obligated and expended for all environmental restorations and compliance programs by program and by source of funds, i.e., appropriation account, for the past 4 fiscal years, including FY 1991 (when available).

Programs

Funds: DERA 5

Installation Restoration (IR)	FY 88:	46,000
	FY 89:	325,000
	FY 90:	1,383,000
	FY 91:	2,663,000
Underground Storage Tank (UST)	FY 88:	130,000
	FY 88:	0
	FY 90:	86,000
	FY 91:	903,000
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	FY 88:	69,000
	FY 88:	1,927,000
	FY 90:	480,000
	FY 91:	364,000
IB Salary Support	FY 88:	36,000
	FY 90:	60,000
	FY 81:	60,000

180000