



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
SOUTHERN DIVISION  
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND  
2155 EAGLE DR., P O BOX 10068  
CHARLESTON S C 29411-0068

32501.000  
09.01.00.0069

5090  
1851/11

CERTIFIED MAIL- RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Eric Nuzie  
Federal Facilities Coordinator  
Florida Department of Environmental Regulation  
Twin Towers Office Building  
2600 Blair Stone Road  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

JUN 22 1992  
JUN 26 1992

N00204.AR.000387  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

Dear Mr. Nuzie:

Enclosed for your review are our responses to your comments on the following documents: Revised Generic SMP, Revised PMP, Revised QAPP, and Revised HASP prepared by Ecology and Environment, Inc., and the Draft Phase I Workplan for Group L (screening sites). The revised documents are to be finalized based on your concurrence with our responses and incorporation of your comments. The Draft/Final Phase I workplan for Group L is due 60 days after the receipt of our responses which is August 24, 1992.

Please contact Ms. Linda Martin, Code 1851, at (803) 743-0574, if you should have any questions regarding these documents.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. MALONE, JR., P.E.  
MANAGER, INSTALLATION  
RESTORATION, EAST SECTION

copy to:  
NAS Pensacola (Mr. Ron Joyner)  
EPA (Ms. Allison Drew)

4

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM  
THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION (FDER)  
DRAFT GENERIC PROJECT DOCUMENTS,  
NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS) PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

**GENERAL HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION ASSESSMENT**

**Comment 1:**

The above-referenced document is satisfactory for its purpose hence, no comments are necessary.

**GENERIC QUALITY ASSURANCE PROJECT PLAN**

**Comment 1:**

The above-referenced document incorporates changes from the last version of the document hence, no comments are necessary.

**OBJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**Comment 1:**

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

**SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN (SMP)**

**Comment 1:**

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 6 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 RPH 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.

**Response:**

Given that the revised generic project documents were submitted prior to the above-cited meeting, they did not incorporate the document submittal changes cited above by FDER. As agreed upon at the January 13, 1992, Remedial Project Manager's meeting in Atlanta, the only drafts which will be submitted in the future will be the 100% draft and the draft final, both of which will go to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), FDER, and the Technical Review Committee (TRC) for review. The text in the SHP on pages 4-4 and 4-5 has been modified accordingly.