

N60508.AR.000919
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER AND COMMENTS FROM U S EPA REGION IV REGARDING PROPOSED PLAN
SITE 2 NORTHWEST OPEN DISPOSAL AREA NAS WHITING FIELD FL
10/19/1998
U S EPA REGION IV



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

04.08.02.0001

00277

October 19, 1998

4WD-FFB

Ms. Linda Martin
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
P.O. Box 190010
2155 Eagle Drive
North Charleston, South Carolina 29419-9010

SUBJ: PP for Site 2

Dear Ms. Martin:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has received and reviewed the Proposed Plan (PP) for Site 2, Northwest Open Disposal Area, at NAS Whiting Field, dated September 1998. The following are EPA's comments based on this review:

- **Page 1, First Column.** The second sentence of the first paragraph should state that the LUCs would restrict use of the site to activities involving less than full-time contact with surface and subsurface soils at the site.

In the second paragraph, the PP should state that this response action only addresses surface and subsurface soils at Site 2. The text should further state that there is no surface water or sediment at the site.

- **Page 1, Second Column.** The "Operation History" section should include the dates of operation of the site instead of including this information in the "Waste Disposal History" section of the PP.
- **Page 2, First Column.** The "Regulatory Framework" section should address the NPL status of NAS Whiting Field as it relates to the response actions being taken.

The IR program stages schematic should also include the Record of Decision. In addition, in the sentence under the schematic, the text should state that the RI and FS findings indicate that LUCs are the "most feasible" or the "most cost effective" means of protecting human health and the environment rather than the "preferred action".

In the General Site Conditions section under the Soil subheading, the second bulleted item should indicate that it could not be determined whether or not these two contaminants are related to past waste disposal or are naturally occurring.

- **Page 2, Second Column, Groundwater Section.** Remove the first bulleted item as it cannot be determined how pH relates to the chemical findings and may serve to confuse the reader.

In the second bulleted item, the word "regulation" should be changed to "regulatory".

In the third bulleted item, insert the word "secondary" in between the words "meet" and "federal". In addition, the text should clarify that secondary drinking water standards are unenforceable federal and State guidelines regarding taste, odor, color and certain other non-aesthetic effects of drinking water.

- **Page 3, Second Column.** The word "convenient" is misspelled in the third sentence of the second paragraph.

If you should have any questions or comments, please contact me at (404) 562-8555.

Sincerely,



Craig A. Behedikt
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Branch

cc: Jim Cason, FDEP