

32501.000
03.04.00.0007

Code 18211

N00204.AR.000332
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN **RECEIPT** REQUESTED

Ms. Allison Drew
Environmental Protection Agency
Region IV
Waste Management Division
RCRA and Federal Facilities Branch
345 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30365

Dear **Ms.** Drew:

In accordance with the Signed Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), the Quarterly Progress **Report**, enclosure (1), and the draft Administrative Record (AR) file index (which is under development) for the Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida, enclosure (2) are **forwarded** for your review.

Please contact **Ms.** Suzanne O. Sanborn, Code 18211 at (803)743-0574, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. MALONE, Jr., P. E.
MANAGER, INSTALIATION RESTORATION
EAST SECTION

Encl:

- (1) Quarterly Report October-December 1991
- (2) Draft Administrative Record File Index

copy to:
NAS Pensacola (Mr. Ron Joyner, Code 18520)
FDER (**Eric Nuzie**)
Ecology & Environment (John Barksdale)
ENSAFE (Paul Stoddard)

09B
182 File
18211
Daily

18211
~~18211x~~

NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

FOURTH QUARTER, 1991

1 OCTOBER, 1991 - 31 DECEMBER, 1991

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background : A Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) was signed by the U.S. Navy, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the State of Florida via the Florida department of Environmental Regulation on October 23, 1990. The FFA requires the Navy to submit to the other FFA parties on a quarterly basis a Quarterly Progress Report (QPR).

1.2 Scope : As provided for in FFA Part XII, Reporting, the QPR identifies and briefly describes the actions which the Navy has taken to implement FFA requirements in the previous quarter and those actions scheduled in the upcoming quarter. The activity narratives should include a statement on the manner and extent to which the Navy is meeting the schedules provided by the FFA in its Site Management Plan (SMP) and in the approved work plans. In addition to activity descriptions, any problems that caused delays or anticipated problems that might cause delays are identified and the actions the Navy has or plans to take to manage the delays are discussed.

1.3 Schedule : The Navy is to transmit the QPR within 30 days of the end of the previous quarter.

2. FFA ACTIVITIES

2.1 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN

2.1.1 The Navy submitted the draft 1992 Site Management Plan (SMP) to EPA and FDER on 6 September 91 and review comments were received from EPA on 11

October 1991. Approval was given by FDER on 23 September 1991, but was deferred pending EPA's comments and the Navy's response.

2.1.2 The Navy transmitted a revised 1992 SMP to EPA and FDER on 8 November 1991 based on comments by EPA received 11 October 1991.

2.1.3 The Navy has yet to receive final approval from EPA and FDER on the 92 SMP.

2.2 ADMINISTRATION

2.2.1 On 18 November 1991 Code 182 routed a memorandum outlining the transition to be made from Ecology and Environment to Ensafe/Allen & Hoshell.

2.2.2 The administrative requirements stated in the FFA and schedules provided in the SMP have been met during this quarter with exception of one deadline. EPA stated in a letter dated 23 December 1991 that due to the volume of documents submitted and other coincidental deadlines they would be unable to supply comments on Phase I Draft Workplans for Groups O, H, I, L, P, and Q within the 90-day review period ending 22 December 1991 stipulated in the FFA and requested a 20-day extension to 13 January 1992. Preliminary Draft Comments on Groups O, H, I, P, and Q were provided to the Navy at the 13 January 1992 RPM meeting by EPA. Group L Comments were not provided and the Navy was informed that comments would be submitted in 6 - 8 weeks. The Navy requested EPA to formally request an extension on Group L.

2.2.3 Contract negotiation took place between the Navy and Ecology and Environment on the transfer of information from E & E to CLEAN II (Ensafe/Allen & Hoshall).

2.2.4 An RPM Meeting took place in Atlanta at EPA Region IV on 13 January 1992. EPA, FDER, NOAA, and the Navy were present.

3.0 SITE WORK ACTIVITIES PERFORMED

3.1 Ecology and Environment submitted to the Navy the Final Interim Data Reports and the 100% Draft Revised Investigation Work Plans for Site Groups A through E and also submitted to the Navy responses to comments from EPA, FDER, and the TRC for these sites.

3.2 Ecology and Environment submitted to the Navy and NAS Pensacota the 90% Draft Interim Data Reports for Group F.

3.3 Response to review comments were submitted to EPA, NOAA, FDER, FDNR, **NAS** Pensacola, and PWC Pensacola on Draft Workplans **Phase I** and II for Operable Unit 10: Group O on 5 November 1991.

3.4 The Navy submitted comments on the 90% Draft Revised General Health and Safety Plan, Site Management Plan, Project Management Plan, and Generic Quality Assurance Project Plan, Contamination Assessment/Remedial Activities Investigations and the Quarterly Report on 'Groundwater Monitoring Wastewater Treatment Facility, NAS Pensacola on 19 November 1991. These documents were then submitted to the RPM and TRC on 5 January 1992 as 100% Draft.

3.5 On 16 December 1991 FDER submitted comments of approval on Response to Comments on the Interim Data Reports and Proposed Workplans for Phase II Groups A, B, C, D, and E, NAS Pensacola.

3.6 On 20 December 1991 Ecology and Environment submitted to the Navy the Draft November 1991 Quarterly Report on Groundwater Monitoring, Wastewater Treatment Facility, NAS Pensacola.

3.7 On 23 December 1991 The Navy Submitted to Ecology and Environment comments on the 90% Draft/Final Contamination Assessment/Remedial Activities Investigations Workplan for Group O Report Submittal for NAS Pensacola.

3.8 The Navy submitted the Draft/Final Workplans for Operable Unit 10: Group O to the TRC/RPM on 7 January 1992.

3.9 On 15 January 1992 Ecology and Environment submitted to the Navy the Monthly Operation and Maintenance Report on the Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant Groundwater Remediation.

4.0 UPCOMING QUARTER SITE WORK ACTIVITIES

4.1 The CRP is scheduled for revision. EPA has yet to provide comments on the previous version.

4.3 A TRC meeting is tentatively planned for March 1992 at NAS Pensacola. The intent of the meeting is to discuss all comments and responses associated with the Draft Workplans A through E and H, I, L, P, and Q.

4.4 The Department of the Navy has scheduled a meeting for February 4th through the 7th to ensure a smooth transition from E & E, Inc. to **Ensafe/Allen & Hoshall and to**

allow for **E & E**, Inc. to conduct a briefing/orientation/status report on the NAS Pensacola IR Program.

4.5 A formal extension request from the Navy to EPA on the Group O fieldwork will be required and forthcoming due to the transition to the new contract.

4.6 Ensafe/Allen & Hoshall will be contracted to deliver draft QAPP, SMP, PMP, and HSP for their personnel in the IR program for NAS Pensacola sites, which will require TRC/RPM review and comment and approval prior to any fieldwork.

4.7 In the 14 January 1992 ETAG Meeting the Navy was advised by the ETAG Group that the results were needed from the Phase II Workplans for Batch 1 & 2 before the Draft Workplans for OU 15 - 17 could be developed. Therefore, submittal of the Draft Workplans for OU 15 - 17 will be delayed until middle to late 1993.

4.8 A comprehensive document based on the Final Interim Data Reports for Batch 1 and 2 may be developed for the scoping meeting on OU 15 - 17 as requested by EPA. FDER and other Natural Trustees (Fish and Wildlife Service, NOM, and FDNR) may be present.

4.9 The Navy will be in contact with EPA on the subject of a Ecological Study performed by EPA for the Navy on a cost reimbursement basis.