



EnSafe / Allen

a joint venture for profess:

32501.032
13.03.32.0006

N00204.AR.001142
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

Program Management Office

Shelby Oaks Plaza
5909 Shelby Oaks Dr.
Suite 201
Memphis, TN 38134
Phone (901)383-9115
Fax (901)383-1743

EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Branch Offices:

Charleston
935 Houston Northcutt Blvd.
Suite 113
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
Phone (803) 884-0029
Fax (803) 856-0107

Cincinnati
400 TechCenter Dr.
Suite 301
Milford, OH 45151
(513) 248-8449
(513) 248-8447

Pensacola
2114 Airport Blvd
Suite 1150
Pensacola, FL 32504
Phone (904) 479-4595
Fax (904) 479-9120

Norfolk
303 Butler Farm Road
Suite 113
Hampton, VA 23666
Phone (804) 766-9556
Fax (804) 766-9558

Raleigh
5540 Centerview Drive
Suite 205
Raleigh, NC 27606
Phone (919)851-1686
Fax (919)851-4043

Nashville
311 Plus Park Blvd.
Suite 130
Nashville, TN 37217
Phone (615) 399-8800
Fax (615) 399-7467

Dallas
Fuller Drive
Suite 726
Dallas, TX 75038
Phone (214) 791-3222
Fax (214) 791-0405

May 23, 1996

John A. Early
4 Waycross Avenue
Pensacola, Florida 32507

Re: Responsiveness Summary
Operable Unit 10 Record of Decision
Naval Air Station Pensacola
Pensacola, Florida

Dear Mr. Early:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall is pleased to submit one copy of the Operable Unit 10 Record of Decision Responsiveness Summary for your review. The summary would be included as Appendix B in the previously submitted Record of Decision. We look forward to hearing any comments you may have at the May 28, 1996 RAB meeting. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments regarding the summary.

Sincerely,

EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall

Allison L. Dennen
Task Order Manager

Enclosure

cc: Lt. Commander Monachino — 1 copy
Mr. Bill Hill, Code 1851 SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM — 1 copy
Ms. Kim Reavis, Code 0233KR SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM without enclosure
Mr. Ron Joyner, NAS Pensacola — 1 copy
Ms. Michele Harrison, NAS Pensacola — 1 copy
Mr. Thomas McAlpin — 1 copy
Ms. Lisa Minshew — 1 copy
Mr. Jerry Westmoreland — 1 copy
Mr. Jesse Rigby — 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall CTO 083 file without enclosure
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall file — 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Pensacola — 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Library — 1 copy

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Overview

During the public comment period, the **U.S.** Navy proposed a preferred remedy to address soil and groundwater contamination at OU **10** on NAS Pensacola. This preferred remedy was selected in coordination with the USEPA and the FDEP. The NAS Pensacola Restoration Advisory Board, a group of community volunteers, reviewed the technical details of the selected remedy.

The sections below describe the background of community involvement on the project and comments received during the public comment period.

Background of Community Involvement

Throughout the site's history, the community has been kept abreast of site activities through press releases to the local newspaper and television stations that reported on site activities. Site related documents were made available to the public in the administrative record at information repositories maintained at the NAS Pensacola Library, the West Florida Regional Library, and the John C. Pace Library of the University of West Florida.

On February **15, 1996**, newspaper announcements were placed to announce the date and location of the public meeting to present **the** proposed plan, the public comment period (February **19** through April **4, 1996**) and included a short description of the proposed plan. The announcement appeared in the *Pensacola News Journal*. In conjunction with these newspaper announcements, copies of the proposed plan were mailed to addresses on the Installation Restoration Program mailing list. **A** public meeting was held at the Pensacola Junior College Warrington Campus on February **27, 1996**. In addition to the five Restoration Advisory Board community members, one citizen attended.

A responsiveness *summary* is required to document how the Navy addressed citizen comments and concerns, raised during the public comment period. All comments summarized in the appendix have been factored into the final decisions of the remedial action for OU **10** at NAS Pensacola.

Summary of Major Questions and Comments Received During the Public Comment Period and the Navy's Responses

Comment	Response
1. Will the contaminants detected in soil affect the NAS Pensacola drinking water?	<p>The aquifer beneath OU 10 is considered a potable water source by the State of Florida. However, NAS Pensacola receives all of its potable water from Corry Station, approximately 4 miles away. In addition, Bayou Grande and Pensacola Bay limit groundwater use to the north, east and west of the site. The institutional control remedy would prevent site groundwater from being used for potable water.</p> <p>The RCRA groundwater treatment system will also be modified to contain and remediate the contaminants detected in OU 10 groundwater. If the leachability study finds the contaminated soil to be adversely impacting groundwater, the soil will be removed.</p>
2. Should the NAS Pensacola residents be given carbon-filtering devices or millipore filters to put on all faucets used for drinking water?	<p>NAS Pensacola receives all of its potable water from Cony Station, approximately 4 miles away. The potable water is tested regularly and does not pose a risk to the NAS Pensacola residents. If contaminants are detected in the potable water supply, NAS Pensacola residents are notified and appropriate action is taken. Therefore, filtering systems are not required currently for NAS Pensacola residents.</p>
3. If the contaminated soil is excavated and dumped somewhere else, will it leach into the groundwater at that location?	<p>As explained in the Feasibility Study report, excavation effectively protects human health and the environment. If the soil is removed for offsite disposal, the soil would be taken to an approved facility that is equipped to handle this type of waste.</p>

Summary of Major Questions and Comments Received During the Public Comment Period and the Navy's Responses

Comment	Response
4. Will the asphalt cap allow the contaminants to continue to leach into the soil and eventually contaminate the aquifer?	As explained in the Feasibility Study report, capping effectively protects human health and the environment. Capping contaminated soil reduces the amount of rainwater that can move through the contaminated soil and pick up contaminants along the way, thereby reducing the impact to groundwater.
5. How will groundwater contamination reaching Pensacola Bay be addressed?	Pensacola Bay, Bayou Grande, and NAS Pensacola wetlands will be addressed during the remedial investigations of those sites. Groundwater contamination at OU 10 will be remediated by modifying and expanding the existing RCRA recovery system to capture the contaminated groundwater before it reaches the bay.
6. Is the area safe for industrial users?	The baseline risk assessment concluded that there was no unacceptable risk to industrial users of the site. If excavation was required at any of the contaminated areas, the work would be monitored to prevent unacceptable exposure.
7. If the leachability study shows that the soil is adversely impacting groundwater, how much will it cost to implement both Alternatives 2 and 4?	If the leachability study shows the soil to be adversely impacting groundwater, the costs would include both the \$130,000 estimated for Alternative 2 and the \$247,000 estimated for Alternative 4 totalling \$377,000 .