



32501.015
04.01.15.0008

ENSAFE INC.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

5724 Summer Trees Drive • Memphis, Tennessee 38134 • Telephone 901-372-7962 • Facsimile 901-372-2454 • www.ensafe.com
August 5, 1999

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Attn: Ms. Gena Townsend
Atlanta Federal Center
100 Alabama Street **SW**
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104

N00204.AR.001789
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

Re: Final Proposed Plan and Public Notice
Operable Unit 4 (Site 15, Pesticide Rinsate Disposal Area), NAS Pensacola
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/083

Dear Ms. Townsend:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe Inc. is pleased to submit two copies of the Final Proposed Plan and Public Notice for Operable Unit 4 (Site 15), at the Naval Air Station Pensacola in Pensacola, Florida. Also, enclosed are responses to USEPA and FDEP comments.

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. Harris
Task Order Manager

Enclosure

cc: Bill Hill, Code 1851 SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM without enclosure
Ron Joyner, NAS Pensacola - 3 copies
Tom Dillon, NOAA - 1 copy
EnSafe Inc. file - 1 copy
EnSafe Inc. Knoxville - 1 copy
EnSafe Inc. Library - 1 copy
Administrative Record

RESPONSES TO TECHNICAL COMMENTS
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION IV
NAS PENSACOLA
PROPOSED PLAN - SITE 15 (OPERABLE UNIT 4)

Comment 1:

In the "Description of Alternatives" section, include the ARARs and estimated implementation time frames associated with each alternative.

Response:

Mention of media-specific ARARs were added to the "Comparison of Alternatives" paragraphs, introducing the alternatives for soil and groundwater.

Comment 2:

Include the lengths of time estimated to achieve degradation of contaminants for Alternative G-2. [*note: It should be stressed that by removal of the source, (soil contamination), the groundwater should return to its natural state.]

Response:

The estimated degradation time **was** added to this paragraph, and a statement **was** added which stresses the positive impact of source removal on groundwater degradation.

Comment 3:

Include a description of the short-term and long-term effectiveness of the proposed remedies.

Response:

Discussions of short-term and long-term effectiveness have **been** incorporated into the "Comparison of Alternatives" section.

Comment 4:

Add direction of groundwater flow to figure.

Response:

This has been done.

Comment 5:

The selected groundwater remedy (G-2) costs more and has a longer remediation time frame than G-3 "Groundwater Recovery and Discharge." G-2 should not take **30** years for remediation once the source is removed. The G-2 alternative should be modified or this selection does not seem like a wise choice.

Response:

The text in the Proposed Plan has been modified to include this clarification.