

N60508.AR.000986
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING FEASIBILITY STUDY SITE 12 TETRAETHYL LEAD DISPOSAL AREA
NAS WHITING FIELD FL
4/21/1999
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



Department of Environmental Protection

09.01.12.0002

00438

Jeb Bush
Governor

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

David B. Struhs
Secretary

April 21, 1999

Ms. Linda Martin
Department of the Navy, Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
2155 Eagle Drive, PO Box 190010
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

file: 12fs1.doc

RE: Feasibility Study: Site 12, Tetraethyl Lead Disposal Area; NAS Whiting Field


Dear Ms. Martin:

Greg Brown and I have reviewed the above document dated January 1999 (received February 12, 1999). Please note that I have not reviewed the final remedial investigation report for this site. Based on the Navy's responses to my comments and to Craig Benedikt's comments on the draft RI, our response to the final Feasibility Study may change.

Attached are Greg's comments for Site 12. Greg has judged it to be adequate for its intent, but has made several comments. Please address his comments, as appropriate, in the final document.

If you have questions or require further clarification, please contact me at (850) 921-4230.

Sincerely,



James H. Cason, P.G.
Remedial Project Manager

Attachment (1)

cc: Craig Benedikt, USEPA Atlanta
Rao Angara, HLA, Tallahassee

TJB B JJC JJC ESN ESN

"Protect, Conserve and Manage Florida's Environment and Natural Resources"

Printed on recycled paper.

Memorandum

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

TO: Jim Cason, P.G., Remedial Project Manager, Technical Review Section

THROUGH: Tim Bahr, P.G., Supervisor, Technical Review Section ³

FROM: Greg Brown, P.E., Professional Engineer II, Technical Review Section ^{AB}

DATE: March 8, 1999

SUBJECT: Draft Feasibility Study, Site 12, Tetraethyl Lead Disposal Area, NAS Whiting Field, Milton, Florida.

I reviewed the subject draft document dated January 1999 (received January 12, 1999). It is adequate for its intent. I have some minor comments. Alternative 3 includes soil excavation and removal. Land use controls are also included in this alternative, however, implying that risks will remain at the site regardless of soil removal. Land use controls in Alternative 3 also contribute \$113,992 to the total cost of this alternative. (Cost for identical land use controls specified in Alternative 2 is \$105,414, \$8,578 less than Alternative 3). An explanation of the marginal benefits of soil removal should be described in Alternative 3 to justify its specification, along with rationales for cost differences due to land use controls. The draft document currently does not make these easily apparent. If you have any questions, please call me at (850) 488-3935.