

January 19, 1993
Code 1851/SOS

NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

N00204.AR.000501

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

FIRST QUARTER, 1992

1 JANUARY, 1992 - 31 MARCH, 1992

1.0. 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.

2.0. FFA ACTIVITIES

2.1. SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN

2.1.1. The Navy submitted the Final **1992** Site Management Plan (SMP) and Navy's responses to EPA comments to EPA and FDER on **27** March after receiving review comments from EPA on January 8, **1992** on the Draft/Final November **8, 1992** submittal. EPA's and FDER's concurrence is expected.

2.1.2. The Navy expects the Federal and State agencies to **review/provide all** comment/and concur with all future SMP submittals no later than December **2** of

the submittal year. The SMP is to be approved by December 2, or dispute resolution is to be used.

2.2. ADMINISTRATION

2.2.1. On 13-14 January 1992, a RPM meeting was held and a meeting with the ETAG members in Atlanta, Georgia to discuss Draft Phase I Workplans Groups H, I, L, P, Q and Revised Draft Phase I & II Workplan Group O, and Draft Phase II Workplans for Groups A through E.

2.2.2. On January 3, 1992, the Navy received a request for a 20-day extension to the 90 day review period from EPA in order for them to complete their review and provide comments on the Draft Phase I Workplans for OU 11-14.

2.2.3. Contract negotiation took place between the Navy and Ecology and Environment on the Development of the Comprehensive Result Report as it pertains to the Ecological requirements as well as to develop the Phase II Draft Workplans for Batch 2: OU 6-9..

2.2.4. On January 7, 1992, the Navy transmitted the Draft/Final Workplan for OU 10 after incorporating and responding to EPA's comments.

2.2.5. On January 22, 1992, the Navy transmitted the Fourth Quarter, Quarterly Report for 1991.

2.2.6. On January 24, 1992, the Navy received review comments for the Draft/Final Workplan for OU 10 from EPA.

2.2.7. On January 28, 1992, the Navy received comments from Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc. on a project at NAS Pensacola.

2.2.8. On February 4, 1992, the Navy and Ecology & Environment, Inc. held a transition/orientation meeting at NAS Pensacola for the new Clean II contractor-Ensafe/Allen & Hoshall.

2.2.9. On February 5, 1992, the Navy received review comments from FDER and responds to comments for the Quarterly Report for the NAS Pensacola Wastewater Treatment Facility's Groundwater Monitoring System. In addition, the Navy received FDER comments on the PMP, SMP, GHSP, GQAPP and the Group O: OU 10 Draft/Final Workplan prepared by E&E, Inc. On January 16, 1992, the Navy received comments from FDNR on the same documents mentioned above. The Navy responded to all comment in accordance with the expedited schedule where

appropriate.

2.2.10. On February 6, 1992, the Navy transmits their responses to comments and the Final Workplan for OU 10 to the RPMs/TRC.

2.2.12. On February 7, 1992, the Navy receives EPA's review comments on the Draft Workplans for OU 1-5 and 11-14.

2.2.13. On February 14, 1992, the Navy receives EPA review comments on the Final submittal for RI/FS Workplan at OU 10 which had to be addressed prior to finalization/and concurrence.

2.2.14. On February 14, 1991, the Navy receives the January 1992 Monthly Operation and Maintenance Report on the Industrial Waste-water Treatment Plant Groundwater Remediation at NAS Pensacola.

2.2.15. On February 18-19, Ensafe/Allen & Hoshall and the Navy met in Charleston, South Carolina.

2.2.16. On February 19, 1992, the Navy receives the Draft minutes from the January 13-14 RPM/ETAG meeting held in Atlanta, Georgia prepared by E&E, Inc.

2.2.17. On February 23, 1992, the Navy received the Ecological EPA comment for OU 1-5 Draft Phase II Workplans.

2.2.19. On February 24, 1992, the Navy receives the Draft Minutes of the February 4-5, Ensafe Transitional Assistance meeting from E&E, Inc.

2.2.20. On February 25, 1992, the Navy receives from E&E, Inc the index of NAS Pensacola Project-Related Reports Submittal sent to Ensafe/Allen & Hoshall.

2.2.21. On March 2, 1992, the Navy transmits to the RPMs, and activity, and state district personnel the 35% Draft Pumping System Replacement Design Package for the Recovery System at the NAS Pensacola. IWTP prepared by E&E, Inc.

2.2.22. On March 9, 1992, the Navy transmits the responses to EPA's comment and the Finalized RI/FS Workplan for OU 10.

2.2.23. On March 10, 1992, the Navy receives the February 1992 Monthly Operation and Maintenance Report on the IWTP Groundwater Remediation Project.

2.2.24. On March 10, 1992, the Navy responds to **FDER's** comments for the Draft November 1991 Quarterly Monitoring Report for the **IWTP** at NAS Pensacola, in addition, the Navy finalizes the document.

Also, the Navy received comments from **FDNR** on the Site Visit held on March 5-6 at NAS Pensacola.

2.2.25. On March 13, 1992, the Navy responds to **EPA's** letter sent to Washington and brings to **EPA's** attention the length of their review process.

2.2.26. On March 16, 1992, the Navy receives the Project-Related Correspondence Submittal index prepared by **E&E, Inc.** for **Ensafe/Allen & Hoshall**.

2.2.27. On March 17, 1992, the Navy receives from **Ensafe** the minutes from the meeting held at NAS Pensacola, Florida with the activity, **ETAG**, **EPA**, and the two contractors (**E&E, Inc.**, and **Ensafe**).

2.2.28. On March 17, 1992, the Navy transmits to **EPA**, **FDER**, **Activity**, and two contractor an explanation on the development and submittal of the Finalized 1992 **SMP**, responses to **EPA's** comments, the Informal Expedited Schedule, and the Draft 1993 **SMP** by March 31, 1992.

2.2.29. On March 25, 1992, the Navy transmits to **E&E, Inc.** their comments on the Draft Interim Data Reports for Batch 2: **OU 6-9**.

2.2.30. On March 25, 1992, the Navy receives the Draft January 1992 Semiannual Report on the Groundwater Monitoring Wastewater Treatment Facility .

2.2.31. On March 27, 1992, the Navy transmits the Finalized 1992 **SMP**, informal expedited schedule, responses to **SMP** comments and **Group O: OU 10** comments, and the Draft 1993 **SMP**, and the Finalized **Group O: OU 10** Workplan.

2.2.32. On March 30, 1992, the Navy explains it funding and resource situations to the Federal and State agencies.

3.0. SITE WORK ACTIVITIES PERFORMED

3.1. The Navy contracted **E&E, Inc.** in February 1992 to preform additional pump repairs to bring recovery well **RW-3** on-line as part of the **IWTP** Recovery System.

3.2. Continued weekly inspection and **O&M** of the **IWTP** groundwater recovery system and the submittal of a monthly **O&M** report.

4.0 UPCOMING QUARTER SITE WORK ACTIVITIES

- 4.1. The CRP is scheduled for revision. EPA provides comments on March 13, 1992 on the Final Approved CRP version.
- 4.2. A TRC meeting is tentatively planned for May 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.
- 4.3. A formal extension request from the Navy to EPA on the Group O fieldwork will be required and was submitted, and the regulatory agencies concurrence is necessary.
- 4.4. 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.
- 4.5. 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 may be delayed until middle to late 1993, however, we hope to deliver the Draft Workplans by December 1992 if everything goes smoothly and as planned.
- 4.6. A comprehensive document based on the Final Interim Data Reports for Batches 1 & 2 will be developed for the scoping meeting on OU 15 - 17 as requested by EPA hopefully by July 1992. FDER and other Natural Trustees (Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA, and FDNR) will be requested to be present.
- 4.7. 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.