



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

December 1, 1992

Stephen Chao
Western Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Way, Bldg. 101
San Bruno, CA 94066-0720

Dear Mr. Chao:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Navy's responses to agency comments on the Draft Final RI Report for OU 4, dated October 16, 1992. We have the attached technical comment to make, provided by our consultant SAIC. In addition, we refer you to our letter of October 21, 1992 regarding the status of OU 2 and OU 4. As stated in that letter, the OU 4 RI should be repackaged as a site characterization report, and not finalized.

We are not providing comments on the Draft OU 2 Feasibility Study Report dated October 1, 1992 at this time since it will require revision with respect to which sites are included in it. Again, our letter of October 21, 1992 states our position with respect to the status of OU 2.

Please call me at (415) 744-2385 if you have any questions. We look forward to meeting with you this Friday, at 1:30 in conference room 1205 here at EPA, to discuss your letter of November 18, 1992.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Roberta Blank".

Roberta Blank
Remedial Project Manager

cc: Cyrus Shabahari, DTSC
Elizabeth Adams, RWQCB



Science Applications International Corporation
An Employee-Owned Company
Technology Services Company

November 6, 1992

DCN: TZ4-C09015-RN-M15237

Ms. Roberta Blank (H-9-2)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Ref: EPA Contract No. 68-W9-0008; EPA Work Assignment No. C09015
SAIC/TSC Project No. 06-0794-03-0630
Site Characterization Report (formerly Operable Unit 4): Response to Comments

Dear Roberta:

SAIC/TSC has completed its review of the Response to Comments from International Technology Corp. (IT). As we have discussed, only those issues having a noticeable impact on the progression of continued remedial efforts at NAS Moffett Field will be presented.

Specific Comment No. 13 addressed the calculation of the groundwater volumes used in footnotes to Table 5.2-5. The following calculation was provided by the Navy, in their response, for the volume of water contained in one cell of the contaminant transport model:

$$150 \text{ ft} \times 150 \text{ ft} \times 10 \text{ ft} \times 30\% = 5.75 \times 10^4 \text{ ft}^3$$

This was a correction to the $0.82 \times 10^4 \text{ ft}^3$ provided in the August 1992 report.

The correct volume should be $6.75 \times 10^4 \text{ ft}^3$. Placing the incorrect volumes into this and subsequent groundwater models will impact the perception of flow volumes, which in turn could impact the remedial design/remedial action.

The remainder of the Response to Comments from IT addressed SAIC/TSC's concerns, for the most part. If you have any questions concerning these comments, please call me at (415) 399-0140.

Sincerely,

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
Technology Services Company

Fred Molloy
Work Assignment Manager