



**EnSafe / Allen & Hoshall**  
a joint venture for professionals

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

32501.005  
09.01.05.0005

N00204.AR.000951  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

July 10, 1995

Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Federal Facilities Coordinator  
Attn: David Clowes  
Twin Towers Office Building  
2600 Blair Stone Road  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Re: Final Preliminary Site Characterization Report,  
Site **5**, NAS Pensacola  
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/970

Dear Mr. Clowes:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall is pleased to submit two copies of the Final Preliminary Site Characterization Report for Site **5** at the Naval Air Station Pensacola in Pensacola, Florida.

If you should have any questions or need any additional information regarding the report, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall

Brian Caldwell  
*Task Order Manager*

Enclosure

cc: Bill Hill, SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM without enclosure  
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall file without enclosure  
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall CTO file without enclosure  
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Pensacola file without enclosure

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
**DRAFT** PRELIMINARY SITE CHARACTERIZATION REPORT: **SITE 5**  
NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS) PENSACOLA  
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

**COMMENT 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.

**RESPONSE:**

Sampling and analysis of Site **5** samples were conducted in December **1993** which predate the June **1994** agreement. In addition, the request for predilution data must be made before the analyses. Therefore, predilution data for Site **5** are not available.

**COMMENT 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.

**RESPONSE:**

As discussed in the April **1995** Tier 1 Partnering Team meeting, the levels of manganese and lead are characteristic of detected concentrations in the **NAS** Pensacola **area** and **can** be attributed to natural conditions. As agreed during the meeting, groundwater will not be resampled.

**COMMENT 3:**

Why is the quantitation level elevated (1200  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) for volatiles in soil sample 05S0308? 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 responsible) **and** concentration should be documented and explained.

**RESPONSE:**

Sample 05S0308 **was run** at the medium level quantitation level of 1,200  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ , resulting from a combination of three factors. **Fi**, matrix interferences caused the original volatile analysis **to** be rerun at the higher quantitation level. Secondly, the target analyte methylene chloride **was present** in the initial **run** at a concentration of 1,400  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  and likely represented laboratory contamination. In the subsequent run, however, it qualified **as** a non-detect. Finally, a tentatively identified compound (**TIC**)**was** detected at 2,100  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  in the initial run.

**COMMENT 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.

**RESPONSE:**

The contamination at Site **3221NE** will be addressed under the FDEP petroleum program and **is** not associated with Site 5.

**COMMENT 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.

**RESPONSE:**

Agreed.

**COMMENT 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.

**RESPONSE:**

Agreed.