

N60508.AR.000766
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

U S NAVY RESPONSE TO FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMENTS TO TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NUMBER TWO REMEDIAL
INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY PHASE IIA FOR GEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT NAS
WHITING FIELD FL
3/2/1995
NAS WHITING FIELD

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)
RI/FS Phase IIA
Technical Memorandum No. 2, Geologic Assessment
NAS Whiting Field , Milton, Florida**

The response to specific comments as identified in the March 2, 1995 letter have been addressed below. However because the document has already been published in the final edition, modifications to the text will not be completed. The comments will be incorporated in future investigations and reports for the RI\FS at NAS Whiting Field.

Specific Comments

1. **WHF-16-2D on Figure 3-6 appears to correlate as WHF-16-2I on Figure 3-5 cross section A-A'. Which is correct?**

The designation WHF-16-2D is correct on Figure 3-6. Figure 3-5 should display a soil boring designation immediately south of monitoring well WHF-16-2I indicating the location of soil boring WHF-16-2D. Originally a deep monitoring well was proposed for this location, however the monitoring well was not installed the borehole was abandoned after completion. In addition text on page 3-6, paragraph 3, line 10 should read "in soil boring WHF-16-2D."

2. **The page correlation designations on Figures 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12 are misnumbered. Figure 3-10, right side, correlates with Figure 3-11; Figure 3-11, left side, correlates with Figure 3-10; Figure 3-11, right side, correlates with Figure 3-12, ; Figure 3-12, left side, correlates with Figure 3-11. Additionally, WHF-11-3 on Figure 3-11 and Figure 3-12 are different; specifically, shouldn't the "pinch outs" appear on Figure 3-11 as well as Figure 3-12 and not continued as is shown on Figure 3-11? A similar problem is on page 3-15, referring to WHF-11-1S and WHF-13-1S; Figures 3-10 and 3-11 should be Figures 3-11 and 3-12, respectively.**

Comments noted and agreed.

3. **On Figure 3-16 and 3-20, a minor typo of "clayee" instead of clayey is present. Of greater importance, however, is the projection on Figure 3-16 of the silty clay unit under wells WHF-29-4 and WHF-29-SB-1. It appears that there may be no reason to project this unit in this manner; are there other data to substantiate this? A similar situation is depicted on Figure 3-18 with wells WHF-30-5 and WHF-30-SB-1. Are data available?**

"Clayee" comment noted. The silty clay unit was not encountered in borings completed at the site, it was projected under Site 29 because all monitoring wells at Site 29 have perched water elevations (See Technical Memorandum No. 4).

Split spoon sample collected at WHF-30-5 from 120 feet bls to 157 feet bls show clay lithology (See Appendix C). The last split spoon sample collected at WHF-30-SB-1 from 120 feet bls was described as a clayey silt with dark yellow orange with gray clay mottling and streaking (Appendix B). The soil boring termination depth may be just above the clay layer. Therefore, uncertainty was shown in Figure 3-18 with clay layer pinching out since other deep wells and borings further to the south do not detect the clay layer.