

N60508.AR.000753
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING REVIEW COMMENTS AND U S NAVY RESPONSES ON DRAFT
FINAL TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 2 GEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT AND TECHNICAL
MEMORANDUM 4 HYDROGEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT NAS WHITING FIELD FL
10/1/1994
NAVFAC SOUTHERN

00363

5090/13

Code 1859

Oct. 94

Bruce Arnette
Florida Department of Environmental Regulation
Technical Review Section / Fourth Floor
Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF DRAFT FINAL TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NUMBER TWO, GEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT, AND DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NUMBER FOUR, HYDROGEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT, REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION (RI), PHASE IIA, NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS), WHITING FIELD, MILTON, FL

Dear Mr. Arnette:

Enclosed are the Navy's response to comments for the referenced documents. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Mr. Jeff Adams, Code 1859, Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, at (803) 743-0341.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. MALONE, P.E.
Head, Installation Restoration I Branch

Encl:

(1) Response to comments

ENVIR
18 circ
1859
Daily
J:\CORR\1859\RESPCOM.2&4

185
1859x JRB
184S JRB

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
of
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION (FDEP)

RI/FS PHASE IIA
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 2 - GEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT
NAS WHITING FIELD, MILTON, FLORIDA

Comment Number	Comment	Response
<u>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</u>		
June 24, 1994 - Comments on draft document.		
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.	Corrections will be made to the text.
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.	Comment noted. All monitoring wells, soil borings, and PCPT locations are presented by region on figures 3-1, 3-4, 3-8, 3-12, and 3-19 in Section 3. Due to inadequacies of scale it is not feasible to show all exploration locations at the facility on a single figure.
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 base-wide cross-sections would be a logical result for inclusion in this document to complement the site specific cross-sections which have been presented.	Figures 3-20 to 3-22 present base-wide cross sections under Section 3.2, Installation-Wide Findings. Fence diagrams for Sites 3, 17, and the Southeast Disposal Area have been completed and will be included in Section 3 of the revised final edition.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
 of
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (FDEP)

RI/FS PHASE IIA
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 2 - GEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT
NAVAL AIR STATION WHITING FIELD, MILTON, FLORIDA

Comment Number	Comment	Response
<p><u>GENERAL COMMENTS</u> August 8, 1994 - Comments on Draft Final document.</p>		
1.	The comments originally made (June 24, 1994) regarding the Draft version of this document have not been addressed. At the least a discussion/meeting should be held to discuss the comments.	The original June 24, 1994 comments were not received in time for inclusion in the Draft Final document. The comments are addressed in the final edition.
2.	There seems to be a lack of communication between personnel involved in the UST investigation and personnel involved in the RI investigation. Prior to submitting this document or any other document where there have been adjacent investigations, personnel from the other activity should verify the locations of monitor wells, soil borings and analytical results.	Comment noted.
3.	Figures 3-12 and 3-19 do not present the same basic data (well locations and similar designation). These and other figures should be proofed to ensure that basic data is the same and accurate.	Figure 3-12 presents the plan view of the cross sections specific to the Industrial Area, where as Figure 3-19 presents the plan view of the cross sections specific to the installation. These figures represent different groups of cross sections.

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
of
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (FDEP)**

**RI/FS PHASE IIA
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 4 - HYDROGEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT
NAS WHITING FIELD, MILTON, FLORIDA**

Comment Number	Comment	Response
1.	The stated objective of this investigation was to provide additional characterization of the hydrogeological conditions at NAS Whiting Field. I do not believe this objective will be reached until all monitoring wells located on the facility have been evaluated. Based on recent findings there appears to be a shallow (approximately 15 feet below land surface) perched water table in the North Fuel Farm area. Regardless of the original reason for installation of monitoring wells (82-770 sites or IR sites), all available information should be incorporated into this and future investigative activities, where appropriate.	The Phase IIA investigation collected data and further characterized the hydrogeologic conditions at NAS Whiting Field. Additionally, Technical Memorandum 4 was to provide a summary of the data collected during the Phase IIA investigation and the RI report will include a compilation of all previous data collected. Furthermore, additional D-size maps are being prepared to show all monitoring well locations in the Industrial area. The maps are forth coming and will be released subsequent to the report.
2.	Page 3-24, 6th paragraph briefly discusses the presence of perched water table conditions at 4 sites within the Industrial Area. The 1st full paragraph on page 3-27 refers to monitoring well WHF-1467-6D; this well does not appear on figures referred to in this Section. In addition, during the discussion of perched water tables, I recommend the inclusion of cross-sections illustrating the cause and presence of those perched water tables.	WHF-1467-6D is part of a monitoring well cluster with WHF-1467-26. They are located next to each other as indicated on Figure 2-1. WHF-1467-6D is not shown on figures in Section 3 because it is considered an intermediate depth well. An interpretation of the subsurface lithology was presented in Technical Memorandum No. 2 - Geologic Assessment. A compilation of all data will be completed in the Remedial Investigation report.
3.	Page 3-29, the last paragraph indicates the presence of perched groundwater at one location in the Southwest Disposal Area, yet this is not discussed in the Section regarding the Southwest Disposal Area. Please elaborate and include in the appropriate section.	Page 3-29, last paragraph has been changed to read "Perched groundwater was encountered only in the industrial area and at one location in the <u>Southeast</u> Disposal Area..." The one location is discussed in Section 3.1.3 Southeast Disposal Area, the last paragraph on page 3-21.
4.	The remainder of the document appears to be adequate for its purposes.	Comment noted.

NASWHF
Comment-10.94

TO : SDIV PLAIN PAPER FAX 1994, 10-14 14:35 #898 P.13/13