

LINE XL
LLL
LAH
LLLLLL

EnSafe / Allen

a joint venture for professio

5720 Summer Trees Dr. Suite 8 Memphis, TN 38134
(901) 383-9115 Fax (901) 383-1743

32501.000
09.01.00.0103

N00204.AR.000629
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

October 6,1993

Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Federal Facilities Coordinator
Attn: Eric Nuzie
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Re: Replacement Page 6
Site 41 — NAS Pensacola: Response to **USEPA Comments**
NAS Pensacola
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/CTO-036

Dear Mr. Nuzie:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall is pleased to submit two copies of the replacement page 6 for the Site 41 — NAS Pensacola Wetlands: *Response to USEPA Comments*. Please replace the previously submitted page with the page enclosed.

Please let us know if you have any questions or *comments*.

Sincerely,

EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall


Allison L. Dennen
Project Geologist

Enclosures

cc: EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall file
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Pensacola
Linda Martin, SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM

Response

- A. The Navy does not feel the data **collected** by the USEPA **ESD is acceptable** for RI work for the following **reasons**.
- Sample locations were not **precisely located**. None of the **figures** presented in the **final USEPA report** were to **scale**. **Therefore, sample** collection at those **locations cannot** be repeated.
 - The USEPA field **notes documenting** how the **sample stations were located** and **sample collection procedures were** not made **available** to the Navy.
 - Quality Assurance/Quality Control sample (i.e., **rinsate blank, field blank, trip blank**) data have **not been** made available to the Navy.
 - The Navy was not given **adequate time (late Friday to Tuesday morning)** to **prepare** to attend the **sampling event** **after** the USEPA had an approved **Sampling and Analysis Plan**. The approved **Sampling and Analysis Plan** was under the condition the Navy would use the **information** if they **chose** to (**between Mickey Hartnet and Linda Martin**), or the USEPA could not go.
- B. The Navy **agrees "minimal potential to impact" is vague**. The sites potential to impact the **NAS Pensacola wetlands** will be **evaluated** during Phase I. See the response to **Comment 8** in the **Common Site 40 and 42 USEPA comments**.

Comment 12. Page 3-3, Figure 3-1:

- A. Although **Site 36** is an extensive site, it must be included in **this figure** (perhaps as a blown-up insert)
- B. To clarify the relationship between **NAS Pensacola Wetlands** and individual **PSCs** at **NAS Pensacola**, the information contained in **Figures 2-1 and 3-1** must **either** be combined into a single figure or **overlain** as two **separate figures**. It would also be **helpful** to **enlarge** these maps. **Perhaps a separate map** could be prepared for each of the **three general contaminant discharge areas** mentioned in **Section 3.2** (page 3-2)

Response

- A. **Site 36** has been added to **Figure 3-1**.
- B. **Figures 2-1 and 3-1** have been combined to show the **NAS Pensacola wetlands** and the individual **PSCs**.

Responses in bold denote changes to first draft.