



Florida Department of Enviro

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

Lawton Chiles, Governor

Carol M. Browner, Secretary

32501.000
09.01.00.0074

N00204.AR.000438

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

October 9, 1992

**CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

Ms. Linda Martin
Code 1851
Department of the Navy
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southern Division
2155 Eagle Drive
P.O. Box 10068
Charleston, South Carolina 29411-0068

Dear Ms. Martin:

Department personnel have completed the review of the Draft Site Management Plan for NAS Pensacola. I have enclosed a memorandum addressed to me from Mr. Jorge Caspary. It documents our comments on the referenced plan.

If I can be of any further assistance with this matter, please contact me at 904/488-0190.

Sincerely,

Eric S. Nuzie
Federal Facilities Coordinator

ESN/bb

Enclosure

cc: Jorge Caspary
Bill Kellenberger
Ron Joyner
Allison Drew
Satish Kastury



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
Bureau of Waste Cleanup

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

FROM: Jorge R. Caspary, P.G. Base Coordinator
Technical Review Section *JRC*

DATE: October 2, 1992

SUBJECT: Review of Draft Site Management Plan (SMP) 1993.
Pensacola Naval Air Station.

The above referenced document has been reviewed and I offer the following comments:

There seems to be confusion regarding various task timeframes. Does the total time period assigned for each task contain a contract award timeframe outside of the total 'duration proposed by the Navy or is the task contracting award time frame included in the total task duration? If this is the case, the time needed to award a contract for each task should be specified in each of the tables presented.

A Table of Contents should be included in all draft document submittals.

pp 2. of 51.- The Navy should update the status of the eleven (11) former Underground Storage Tank (UST) program sites that were transferred to the CERCLA program during the June 17, 1992 Installation Restoration Conference. Please explain what category these PSCs have been assigned.

Table 1-1.- Sites 12, 13, 14, 24, and 36 have been changed to RI/FS status. Please change the table accordingly..

Page 9 of 51.- Please clarify the status of the Gantt charts. Will they be included in the revised/final version of the SMP or as accorded, will they no longer be part of the SMP?

Page 16 of 51.- Is Site 31 still being investigated along with sites 25 and 27?. Table 1-1 indicates otherwise.

Eric S. Nuzie
October 2, 1992
Page Two

Page 18 and 19 of 51.- The proposed removal at the Oak Grove Campground is not accounted for in any of these pages. Please clarify where this action will fall in the context of each of the tasks presented in pp. 19.