



EnSafe / Allen & Hoshall
a joint venture for professional

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

October 6, 1993

32501.000
03.01.00.0085

N00204.AR.000630
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

U.S. Environmental protection Agency
Attn: **Ms. Allison Drew**
345 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30365

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

Dear Ms. Drew:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall is pleased to **submit seven 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 — 2 copies
Ron Joyner, NASP - 13 copies
Tom Moody, FDEP - 1 copy
John Mitchell, FDEP - 1 copy
Waynon Johnson, NOAA - 1 copy
Lynn Griffin, FDEP - 1 copy

Response

- A. The Navy does **not** feel the data collected by the USEPA ESD is acceptable for RI work for the following reasons.
- o 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**.
 - o 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., rinse 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 Earhart 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.