

N60508.AR.000132  
NAS WHITING FIELD  
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING U S EPA REGION IV COMMENTS ON SITE 9 FEASIBILITY STUDY  
NAS WHITING FIELD FL  
6/14/2005  
U S EPA REGION IV



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 4  
ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER  
61 FORSYTH STREET  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8960

June 14, 2005

4WD-FFB

Commanding Officer  
ATTN Code ES31 **Linda Martin**  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southern Division  
P.O. Box 190010  
North Charleston SC 29419-9010

SUBJECT: NAS Whiting Field, Florida  
EPA ID# FL2170023244

Dear Ms. Martin:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has received (electronically) and reviewed the following document:

- **Feasibility Study Addendum for Site 9, Waste Fuel Disposal Pit, Surface and Subsurface Soil, Rev. 0, March 2005, NAS Whiting Field, Milton, FL (Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.).**

Enclosed are EPA's review comments. If you should have any questions, please contact me at (404) 562-8555.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Craig A. Benedikt".

Craig A. Benedikt  
Senior Remedial Project Manager  
Federal Facilities Branch

Enclosure

cc: James Cason, FDEP

**EPA Review Comments**  
**Feasibility Study Addendum**  
**Site 9, Surface and Subsurface Soil**  
**Rev. 0**  
**NAS Whiting Field, Milton, FL**  
**March 2005**

1. **Page v, Acronyms:** “COC” and “COPCs” should be defined as “constituents of concern” and “constituents of potential concern”, respectively. These terms should be revised throughout the document.
2. **Page 2-1, Section 2.1:** This section states subsurface soil samples were not collected at Site 9. A valid justification should be provided to explain why subsurface soil samples were not collected or were not deemed necessary. Chapter 3 of the site specific remedial investigation (RI) states that a geophysical survey was conducted at the site as well as soil gas sampling. The findings from these investigative techniques (Chapter 5 of the RI) should be discussed as a rationale to explain why subsurface soil sampling was not necessary. When an environmental investigation is initiated at a site, it is assumed that all environmental media will be sampled unless a valid rationale is provided which explains why it is not necessary. This same comment applies elsewhere in the document where it states that no subsurface soil samples were collected.
3. **Page 2-4, Section 2.2.2.1:** This section again refers to the fact that no subsurface soil samples were collected at Site 9; however, no rationale is provided. This section should instead state that no subsurface soil samples were deemed necessary with the appropriate rationale provided.
4. **Page 2-5, Table 2-1:** This table should be revised for clarity. Too much information is contained in the table for it to be readable in its current format. The font size is too small to make the table easily viewable.
5. **Page 2-7, Section 2.2.2.2:** See previous comment as it relates to subsurface soil sampling.
6. **Page 2-8, Table 2-3:** This table should be revised for clarity. Too much information is contained in the table for it to be readable in its current format. The font size is too small to make the table easily viewable.
7. **Page 3-1, Section 3.2:** This section should be deleted. Recommendations for remedial responses are not made in the feasibility study. The proposed plan is the document where recommendations for remedial responses are made.
8. **Page R-1, References:** The third reference referring to the 2001 letter from James Cason to James Holland should contain a detailed description of the purpose of the letter.