

N60508.AR.000232  
NAS WHITING FIELD  
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING U S EPA REGION IV COMMENTS ON SITE 10 FEASIBILITY STUDY  
ADDENDUM NAS WHITING FIELD FL  
4/25/2007  
U S EPA REGION IV



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

April 25, 2007

4WD-FFB

Commanding Officer  
Attn: Sarah Reed  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southeast  
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 OU9, Site 10, Southeast Open Disposal Area A Surface and Subsurface Soil at Naval Air Station Whiting Field, Rev. 0, March 21, 2007.** (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 10 Feasibility Study Addendum**  
**NAS Whiting Field**  
**Dated, March 21, 2007**

1. **Table of Contents, Page iv:** Some of the Table of Contents is typed in all capital letters and some of the text is a combination of capital letters and lower case letters. Please revise as appropriate.
2. **Section 1.1, Page 1-2:** In the second paragraph of this section, please change the second sentence as follows: "...described in the Remedial Investigation (RI), the FS, and the General Information Report (GIR)...".
3. **Section 2.0, Page 2-1:** The third paragraph should include a statement that groundwater underlying Site 10 will be addressed under the Site 40 – Basewide Groundwater investigation.
4. **Section 2.2.3, Page 2-6:** This section of the document should indicate whether or not ecological risk was affected by the changes to the standards and the revised list of COCs.
5. **Section 3.1, Page 3-2:** The third sentence of the first paragraph states that CGs are used to determine COCs. This statement is not accurate. COCs are determined in the risk assessment prior to defining cleanup goals.
6. **Section 4.1, Page 4-1:** Alternative S10-2 listed in the second bulleted item should include engineering controls as well as LUCs to account for the soil cover currently located on Site 10 to reduce risk. The third bulleted item lists soil removal and LUCs as Alternative S10-3. It is unclear why LUCs would be required if soil removal took place at Site 10. Please revise as appropriate. The fifth paragraph which describes Alternative S10-2 should address engineering controls as mentioned above. In addition, this paragraph should also describe the type of LUCs which will be required at Site 10.
7. **Table 4-1, Page 4-3:** The second row of this table which describes Alternative 2 should include engineering controls. In addition, if the soil removal described in Alternative 3 would mitigate the risk, then LUCs would not be required and all references to LUCs, LUCAPs, and LUCIPs should be removed from the table. Warning signs and 5 year reviews would also not be required following completion of Alternative 3. The table should be revised accordingly.
8. **Table 4-2, Pages 4-4 and 4-5:** The heading for the column describing Alternative 2 should include engineering controls (ECs) as well as LUCs.
9. **Appendix A:** The heading at the top of the pages describing Alternative 2 should include ECs as well as LUCs.