



32501.000
09.01.00.0054

Florida Department of Environment

Twin Towers Office Bldg. • 2600 Blair Stone Road • Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Lawton Chiles, Governor

Carol M. Browner, Secretary

N00204.AR.000326

February 5, 1992

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Ms. Suzanne O. Sanborn
Code 18211
Department of the Navy
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
2155 Eagle Drive
P.O. Box 10068
Charleston, SC 29411-0068

Dear Ms. Sanborn:

Department personnel have completed the review of the Project Management Plan and the Site Management Plan (SMP) for NAS Pensacola. Although both documents have been determined to be satisfactory for their purpose, I have enclosed a memorandum from Mr. Jorge Caspary to me asking for a minor clarification on the SMP. It involved the review of the 90% draft by us and EPA to make the 100% draft the final document. Your assistance with this matter is appreciated.

If you have any additional questions, please contact me at (904) 488-0190.

Sincerely,

Eric S. Nuzie
Federal Facilities Coordinator

ESN/dd

Enclosure

cc: Bill Kellenberger
Ron Joyner
John Mitchell
Lynn Griffin
Allison Drew



State of Florida
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

For Routing To Other Than The Addressee	
To: _____	Location: _____
To: _____	Location: _____
To: _____	Location: _____
From: _____	Date: _____

Interoffice Memorandum

TO: Eric S. Nuzie, Federal Facilities Coordinator

THROUGH: Dr. James J. Crane, Administrator
Technical Review Section *JJC*

FROM: Jorge R. Caspary, Technical Review Section
Bureau of Waste Cleanup *J.R.C.*

DATE: January 29, 1991

SUBJECT: Review of Project Management Plan and Site Management Plan. NAS Pensacola.

I have reviewed the above mentioned documents and offer the following comments for your consideration.

Project Management Plan CA/RA

This document incorporates comments from the last version of the document, therefore, no additional comments are issued on this version.

Site Management Plan

In general, the document is presented in a concise and clear manner after incorporating comments from the last version, however, there is an issue that merits discussion: on page 4-4 and 4-5, it is stated that "...following receipt of comments from the Navy concerning the 30% draft work plans, E & E will prepare a 90% draft for Navy review. The Navy review comments will be incorporated into the 100% draft work plan which will be submitted to the TRC, EPA, and FDER for review and comments...". At the last RPM meeting held in Atlanta on January 13th, there was a general consensus among EPA, the Navy, its consultant, and FDER that the three parties in the FFA plus the TRC members will receive the **90% draft** and issue appropriate comments so as to make the 100% draft the final document. This step was discussed in the spirit of saving time in the general scheme of the investigation. Clarification from the Navy regarding this issue is requested herein.