32501.005
09.01.05.0004

N00204.AR.000746
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

Department of Environmental Protection

Lawton Chiles
Governor

Twin Towers Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Virginia B. Wetherell
Secretary

July 20, 1994

Mr. Bill Hill
Code 1851
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
P.O. Box 190010
2155 Eagle Drive
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

Dear Mr. Hill:

Department personnel have completed the technical review of the Draft Preliminary Site Characterization Report, Site 5, NAS Pensacola. I have enclosed a memorandum addressed to me from Mr. David M. Clowes. The concerns detailed in Mr. Clowes' memorandum need to be adequately addressed before we can consider approval of the referenced document.

If I can be of any further assistance with this matter, please contact me at 904/488-3935.

Sincerely,

for ESN

Eric S. Nuzie
Federal Facilities Coordinator

ESN/st

Enclosure

cc: David Clowes
John Mitchell
Tom Moody
Ron Joyner
Allison Humphris
Satish Kastury

Florida Department of
Environmental Protection

Memorandum

TO: Eric S. Nuzie, Federal Facilities Coordinator
Bureau of Waste Cleanup

THROUGH: James J. Crane, P.G. Administrator
Technical Review Section JJC

Tim J. Bahr, P.G. Supervisor
Technical Review Section TB

FROM: David M. Clowes, Remedial Project Manager
Technical Review Section DMC

DATE: July 12, 1994

SUBJECT: Draft Preliminary Site Characterization Report, Site 5, Naval Air Station Pensacola.

I have reviewed the above stated document dated March 23, 1994 (received March 24, 1994) submitted for this site. The following comments need to be addressed before this document is considered final:

1. The quantitation limits used for groundwater sample analyses are many times above Florida Primary, Secondary and "free from" Water Quality Standards (Chapters 17-520 and 17-550, F.A.C). Contract Lab Protocol (CLP) should be adjusted so the quantitation limits are at or below State standards. As agreed in the meeting June 26 to 29, 1994, screening data (predilution) will be provided and assessment phases beyond screening will use quantitation limits below CLP, in order to consider the Florida Water Quality Standards.

2. Monitoring well 05GS01 should be resampled to determine if the levels of lead and manganese detected above Florida Water Quality Standards and background levels are due to actual contamination, or just due to excessive turbidity. To decrease turbidity, I recommend that the wells be resampled using Quiescent Sampling (low flow purging using a peristaltic pump with a flow rate of about one liter per minute and waiting up to a maximum of six hours to sample at a low flow rate using a peristaltic pump). Turbidity measurements (using a turbidity meter) should be taken in conjunction with the metals sampling.

3. Why is the quantitation level elevated (1200 ug/kg) for volatiles in soil sample 05S0300? There is not a documented reason for dilution of this sample, such as the high concentration of another volatile, to explain the increased quantitation level. However, if this undocumented volatile is a tentatively identified compound (TIC), the compound (if

MEMORANDUM
Eric S. Nuzie
July 12, 1994
Page Two

possible) and concentration should be documented and explained.

4. Since Site 5 overlaps petroleum Site 3221NE, the presence of VOAs, naphthalene and TCE at Site 3221NE above Florida Primary, Secondary and "free from" Water Quality Standards (Chapters 17-520 and 17-550, F.A.C) should be addressed in the abstract, conclusion and other appropriate sections for Site 5. If this contamination is suspected to be associated with Site 3221NE, not with Site 5, and will be addressed as Site 3221NE, then this should also be discussed.

5. There are errors in the representation of information in Figure 2-3 and Table 2-1 (based on a comparison with the CAR for Site 3221NE). The well numbers, the concentrations of constituents detected, the Florida Guidance Concentration for Naphthalene, and the date the samples were collected are incorrect.

6. The following errors need to be corrected: the symbols in Figure 2-2 need to be identified, and the same symbol for soil borings/monitoring wells should be utilized in the figures as in the legends; groundwater appears to flow north-northwest (Figure 6-1), instead of north-northeast as described on page 6-2; and on Figure 7-1, the first lead analysis of GS0401 is 33.5 ppb not 335 ppb.