

N60508.AR.000167  
NAS WHITING FIELD  
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING U S EPA REGION IV COMMENTS ON SITE 15 FEASIBILITY STUDY  
ADDENDUM NAS WHITING FIELD FL  
7/6/2006  
U S EPA REGION IV



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

July 6, 2006

4WD-FFB

Commanding Officer  
Attn: Sarah Reed  
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. Reed:

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

- **Feasibility Study Addendum for Site 15, Southwest Landfill Surface and Subsurface Soil at Naval Air Station Whiting Field, Rev. 0, June 2006.** (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**  
**Site 15 Feasibility Study Addendum**  
**Surface and Subsurface Soils**  
**NAS Whiting Field**  
**Dated, June 2006**

1. **Section 1.0, Page 1-1:** The third bulleted item refers to the Remedial Investigation (RI) report for Site 40, Basewide Groundwater. The Site 40 RI is still in draft form and should not be referenced in this document.
2. **Section 3.2, Page 3-2:** Add the word “soil” after “subsurface” within the parentheses in the last sentences of both the first and second paragraphs.
3. **Section 4.1, Page 4-1:** The fourth sentence of this section states that this section presents a revised description of the three original remedial alternatives; however, no such description is included within the section. Please provide an additional paragraph within this section to describe the revised alternatives.
4. **Section 4.2, Page 4-1:** The text in this section refers to the seven CERCLA criteria; however, there are nine criteria which the remedial alternatives must be compared against. Please provide an evaluation of the remaining two criteria not currently included in the Feasibility Study Addendum within the text as well as the accompanying tables.
5. **Section 4.2.1, Page 4-1:** The word “remains” is misspelled in the second sentence. Please correct.