



EnSafe / Allen & Hoshall

a joint venture for professionals

32501.042
09.01.42.0002

N00204.AR.001507
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

September 17, 1997

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 45150
Phone (513) 248-8449
Fax (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) 851-1886
Fax (919)851-4043

Nashville
311 Plus Park Blvd.
Suite 130
Nashville, TN 37217
Phone (615)399-6800
Fax (615)399-7467

Dallas
4545 Fuller Drive
Suite 6
Irving, TX 75038
Phone (214)791-3222
Fax (214)791-0405

Florida Department of Environmental Protection
ATTN: John Mitchell
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400

RE: Errata for the Site 42 Remedial Investigation Report
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/0036

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall is pleased to submit two copies of the errata for the Site 42 Remedial Investigation Report at Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida. Also, a **final** response to comments is provided to facilitate the review process. If you should have any questions or need any additional information regarding this document, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall

Henry H. Beiro, P.G.
Task Order Manager

Enclosure

cc: Bill Hill, SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM - 2 copies
Ron Joyner, NAS Pensacola - 2 copies
Gena Townsend, USEPA - 1 copy
Tom Dillon, NOAA - 1 copy
Linda Boldyreff, John C. Pace Library - 1 copy
Judeth Walker, NAS Pensacola - 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall File - 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Library - 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall Pensacola - 1 copy

SITE 42 REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT
NAS PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMENTS

John Mitchell's Comments, July 14, 1997

COMMENT:

1. I agree that most of the contamination exceeding **FDEP** sediment Quality Assessment Guidelines (SQAGs) or USEPA Region IV Sediment Screening Values (SSVs) appear to be scattered across the site and not related to past activities from other Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites at the facility. They also appear to have low to limited risk (HQ < 10) other than the area around the fuel loading/unloading dock near sample locations 042MZ806 and 042MZ805. Therefore, I agree with the recommendation for no further action under CERCLA.

However, the contamination around the fueling dock appears to be strictly petroleum related and cannot be eliminated from further investigation due to the apparent ecological risk (HQ > 10). The source of this contamination is either from: past releases at the dock; current releases from fuel related compounds spilled or stored at the dock; or leaks in the pipeline at the dock. I recommend that this area be identified as a petroleum contaminated site to be investigated under Chapter 62-770 F.A.C.

RESPONSE:

The Navy concurs with the recommendation and has added statements to the Executive Summary and Section 11.0 Conclusion and Recommendations identifying the barge fuel dock for further study under **FAC** Chapter 62-220.

**SITE 42 DRAFT REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT
NAS PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMENTS**

Comments **from** David P. Grabka, E.S.I., June **9, 1997**

COMMENT:

1. The calculation and **use** of Hazard **Indices** (HIs) at **sampling** locations that have calculated Hazard Quotients (HQs) greater than 1 may be a better indication of ecological risk at a particular sampling location than using HQs. By summing the HQs at a particular sampling location, areas that have more chemicals of potential concern detected above threshold effects levels are indicated as being of higher risk to organisms.

RESPONSE:

The HQ is a more powerful screening assessment tool than the HI. The HQ offers chemical specific ratios because the denominator is the screening value for that chemical. The HI is a cumulative value not differentiating effects of chronic versus acute or synergism versus antagonism by the contaminants being grouped. For example, one location detects **only** metals while another location **only** PAHs. From both locations, the HI values are calculated to be the same number, but the risk at one location is primarily an acute risk due to metals while the other is a chronic risk due to the PAHs. The same example could be given for chemicals with synergistic or antagonistic properties. No change is required because producing HIs do not affect the decisions of **this** document.

COMMENT:

2. Seven metals, three pesticides, one PCB and 11 SVOCs exceeded a sediment quality screening value. Silver exceeded the probably effects level (PEL) at two locations; no other metals **exceeded** the PEL. Dieldrin, 4,4'-DDT and **gamma-BHC** (*Lindane*) were the three pesticides and Arochlor-1254 **was** the PCB detected above the threshold effects level (TEL). **Lindane** exceeded the PEL at two locations and 4-4' DDT exceeded the PEL at one location. All concentrations detected for pesticides and PCBs were same order of magnitude as the TELs. At **only** one location did SVOC concentrations exceed the PEL.

At that locations, 042MZ807, concentrations of benzo(a)anthracene, benzo(a)pyrene, **chrysene, fluoranthene and pyrene exceeded the PELs. This location corresponds to the** Barge Fuel Loading **Dock** west of **Sherman's** Point. It is probably that **this** contamination is **from** accidental spills during fuel unloading.

RESPONSE:

The conclusions have **been** revised **to address** the contamination at **the** barge fuel **loading** dock. **All** other contaminants were addressed by the report and require no change to the document.

COMMENT:

3. Figure 4-3. TOC concentrations in **bottom** sediments should be in mg/kg.

RESPONSE:

The **Navy** has made the editorial change.

COMMENT:

4. Page 6-4. Second paragraph.
Percent TOC values ranged **from** **< 0.01 to 4.8** (not .48) based on analyticals supplied **with** the report.

RESPONSE:

The Navy **has made** the editorial change.

COMMENT:

5. Table 7-4.
VQUAL, code D should be explained in **notes** section at the end of the table.

RESPONSE:

The Navy **has** made the editorial change.

COMMENT:

6. Page 7-23.
Last **sentence**. The report should **state the** location(s) at which **tar** balls were found in bay sediments.

RESPONSE:

Since **the** location of "tar balls" were not recorded **by** field crews, **this statement has been** deleted.

COMMENT:

7. Page 13-1.
No Professional Geologist signature or **seal**.

RESPONSE:

This was a draft document and did not require **a** professional geologist seal or signature. This section **has been** sealed and is provided herein.