



32501.042  
09.01.42.0010

ENSAFE INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

5724 Summer Trees Drive • Memphis, Tennessee 38134 • Telephone 901-372-7962 • Facsimile 901-372-2454 • www.ensafe.com

May 7, 1998

N00204.AR.001655

NAS PENSACOLA

5090.3a

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

Re: Final Record of Decision,  
Site 42, NAS Pensacola  
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/083

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe Inc. is pleased to submit two copies of the Final Record of Decision for Site 42, Pensacola Bay at the Naval Air Station Pensacola in Pensacola, Florida. USEPA had concurred with the previous submittal and FDEP provided one comment which is enclosed. The Record of Decision has been signed by the Commanding Officer of the Naval Air Station Pensacola.

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

Sincerely,

EnSafe Inc.

Allison L. Dennen  
*Task Order Manager*

Enclosure

cc: Patricia Kingcade, FDEP – without enclosure  
Tom Moody, FDEP – NW District without enclosure  
Bill Hill, Code 1851 SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM without enclosure  
EnSafe Inc. file without enclosure  
EnSafe Inc. Pensacola file without enclosure  
EnSafe Inc. library without enclosure  
Administrative Record

**Florida Department of Environmental Protection**  
**Response to Technical Comments**  
**Final Record of Decision**  
**Operable Unit 17 (Site 42), NAS Pensacola**

**Comment 1**

The last paragraph of Section 6.3 (Baseline Risk Assessment Conclusions) needs to be modified. It discusses ecological risk related to Site 2 rather than Site **42**. Comparison to the risk assessment at Site **2** is appropriate, but the ecological risk should be correlated to Site **42**. I suggest the following wording:

"Ecological Risk at Site **42** was assessed in comparison to **HQs** which showed adverse effects to the environment at Site **2**, which is another Operable Unit in Pensacola Bay and was investigated separately from Site **42**. The environment at Site **42** was similar and comparable to the Site **2** area. The **HQs** at Site **42** were lower than those which showed adverse effects at Site **2**, except for the area around the barge loading dock. The constituents of concern at the barge loading dock were PAHs which are likely from petroleum products unloaded at the dock. This contamination will be further investigated under Florida's petroleum program."

**Response:**

**Agreed. The last paragraph of Section 6.3 has been modified to the above language.**