



EnSafe / Aller
a joint venture for professional

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

32501.036
09.01.36.0022

N00204.AR.001018
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

October 30, 1995

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

Re: Final Sampling and Analysis Plan
Site 36 **IWTP** Sewer Line
NAS Pensacola
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/CTO-063

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall is pleased to submit two copies of the **Final** Sampling and Analysis Plan for Site 36 — the **IWTP** Sewer **Line** at the **Naval Air** Station Pensacola in Pensacola, Florida. Responses to FDEP and EPA comments **are** also enclosed.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments regarding the plan.

Sincerely,

EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall

Allison L. Dennen
Task Order Manager

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Bill Hill, SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM without enclosure
Ms. Kimberly Reavis, Code 0233KR without enclosure
Mr. **Tom** Moody, FDEP — NW District without enclosure
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall file without enclosure
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Pensacola file without enclosure
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall CTO file without enclosure

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
DRAFT SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN (SAP) FOR SITE 36,
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (IWTP) SEWER
LINE, NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA

COMMENT 1:

Page vi:

Based on the recent assessment of the **IWTP** Sewer Line around Chevalier Field/Building 3380 for BRAC and the detection of soil and groundwater contamination above PRGs, the **status** of Site 36 should be changed **from** screening to RI.

RESPONSE:

As agreed during the June **28** and **29, 1995** Tier 1 Partnering Meeting, decisions on upgrading portions of Site 36 will be made after the entire site is investigated.

COMMENT 2:

The updated, April 5, 1995, Florida Soil Cleanup Goals should be utilized.

RESPONSE:

Agreed.

COMMENT 3:

Though temporary wells are acceptable in delineating groundwater contamination, the cost savings between the proposed temporary wells ("ungouted permanent wells") and permanent wells appears questionable; especially if wells need to be resampled during subsequent phases of assessment and/or remediation. Note, the utilization of direct push temporary wells in the screening phase may decrease groundwater assessment **costs**.

RESPONSE:

Comment noted.

COMMENT 4:

Page 34:

As mentioned previously in comments for other sites in Chevalier Field, all temporary wells should be properly abandoned **as** soon as installed and sampled.

RESPONSE:

Temporary monitoring wells were properly abandoned.

COMMENT 5:

Page 32 and PWC Telespection Report:

The **PWC** report documents exfiltration from the **IWTP** between manholes **C-02** and **C-3**, which contradicts the statement on page 32 of solely infiltration. **Thus**, sampling in **this** area should be biased towards these documented release sites.

RESPONSE:

As discussed in the June **28** and **29, 1995** Tier **1** Partnering Meeting, the **area** noted in'the comment showed groundwater infiltrating the sewer line.

COMMENT 6:

PWC Maintenance Report:

This detailed report does not need to be included in the subject document. However, specific information about sources of contamination such as spills/releases should be presented in a synthesized/abridged format in the Site History Section.

RESPONSE:

As discussed in the June **28** and **29, 1995** Tier **1** Partnering Meeting, the maintenance report will not be included in subsequent revisions. PWC maintenance on the IWTP sewer line will be summarized in Appendix **B**.