

N60508.AR.000744
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER TRANSMITTING REVIEW COMMENTS REGARDING DRAFT TECHNICAL
MEMORANDUM 2 GEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION PHASE 2A NAS
WHITING FIELD FL
6/28/1994
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Department of
Environmental Protection

09.01.00.0050

00358

Lawton Chiles
Governor

Twin Towers Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Virginia B. Wetherell
Secretary

June 28, 1994


Mr. Jeff Adams
Remedial Activities Branch
Department of the Navy
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Post Office Box 190010
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

Dear Mr. Adams:

Department personnel have completed the technical review of the Draft Technical Memorandum No. 2, Geological Assessment, RI-Phase II-A, NAS Whiting Field. I have enclosed a memorandum addressed to me from Mr. Bruce A. Arnett. It documents our comments that need to be adequately addressed in a revised version of the document.

If I can be of any further assistance with this matter, please contact me at 904/488-3935.

Sincerely,



Eric S. Nuzie
Federal Facilities Coordinator

ESN/st

Enclosure

cc: Bruce Arnett
Tom Moody
John Mitchell
James Holland
Robert Pope

Memorandum

Florida Department of
Environmental Protection

TO: Eric S. Nuzie, Federal Facilities Coordinator
Bureau of Waste Cleanup

THROUGH: Dr. James J. Crane, P.G. Administrator *JJC*
Technical Review Section

Tim Bahr, P.G. Supervisor *B*
Technical Review Section

FROM: Bruce A. Arnett, Environmental Specialist II *BA*
Technical Review Section

DATE: June 24, 1994

SUBJECT: Draft Technical Memorandum No. 2, Geological Assessment,
RI-Phase IIA, NAS Whiting Field, Milton, Florida.

I have reviewed the subject document dated June 1994, (received June 7, 1994) and submit the following comments:

1. The text on page 1-13 refers to a report and recommendation that sites currently being investigated through the UST program have been recommended for return to the IR program. The report and recommendation were not received by FDEP until June 16, 1994. The recommendation is currently under review.
2. I suggest that a base map be constructed which shows the location of all monitor wells, soil borings and PCPTs. Several of the site maps at a scale of 1" equals 400' have been developed, and this scale seems to show adequate detail. It is understood that because of reproduction limitations the map may have to be subdivided into quadrants.
3. The attempt to identify correlative clay layers (potential confining units) throughout the facility and on a site specific basis is an excellent endeavor. It would appear that fence diagrams and basewide cross-sections would be a logical result for inclusion in this document to complement the site specific cross-sections which have been presented.

/baa