



EnSafe / Allen &
a joint venture for professionals

5720 Summer Trees Dr. Suite 8 Memphis, TN 38134
(901) 383-9115 Fax (901) 383-1743

32501.032
04.01.32.0010

N00204.AR.001082
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

February 14, 1996

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Attn: Mr. Jay Bassett
345 Courtland Street, **N.E.**
Atlanta, Georgia 30365

Re: Transmittal of Documents
Errata Pages for the Final Focused Feasibility Study
Operable Unit 10, NAS Pensacola
Contract # N62467-89-D-0318/CTO-048

~~Dear~~ Mr. Bassett:

On behalf of the Navy, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall is pleased to submit two copies of the errata pages for the Final Focused Feasibility Study for Operable Unit **10** at the Naval Air Station Pensacola in Pensacola, Florida. The Navy is going to public for the Operable Unit 10 Proposed Plan.

Please let me **know** if you have any questions or comments regarding the **report**.

Sincerely,

EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall

Henry H. Beiro
Task Order Manager

Enclosure

cc: Bill Hill, Code 1851, **SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM** without enclosure
Ron Joyner, **NAS Pensacola** — 7 copies
Denise Klimas, NOAA — 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall CTO file 048 without enclosure
EnSafe/Allen & **Hoshall** file — 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & **Hoshall** Pensacola — 1 copy
EnSafe/Allen & **Hoshall** Library — 1 copy
Kim Reavis, Code 0233KR, **SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM** w/out enclosure

TECHNICAL REVIEW **AND** COMMENTS
FINAL FOCUSED **FEASIBILITY** STUDY: **OU 10 FS**
NAVAL **AIR** STATION (NAS) PENSACOLA
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF **ENVIRONMENTAL** PROTECTION

COMMENT:

1. The Navy's contention is that site-specific risk based cleanup criteria **are** ARARs. **CERCLA** and the NCP describe ARARs as promulgated federal or state environmental or facility siting standards while site-specific risk **based** criteria **are** not.

RESPONSE

Agreed. This comment will be addressed in future feasibility studies.

COMMENT:

2. **An** impression-type metal **seal** for engineering certifications is required in accordance with Chapter **61G15-23, F.A.C.**

RESPONSE:

Agreed. A metal impression-type professional engineer **seal** **has** been included in the FFS errata.

COMMENT:

3. The addition of a list of ARARs, the removal of **soil** and groundwater monitoring from the no action alternative and the addition of document **preparation costs** to cost estimates were requested during the December **13-14, 1995, partnering meeting.**

RESPONSE

These requests have been incorporated into the **FFS**.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, REGION IV

COMMENT:

Include ARARs section in the OU 10 **FFS**

RESPONSE:

Agreed. ARARs have been included in **Appendix A** of the **FFS**.

COMMENT:

Include how groundwater will be cleaned to meet MCLs through RCRA permit action.

RESPONSE:

Agreed. How the groundwater will be cleaned **has** been added to **Section 2**, Assembly of Alternative.

COMMENT:

Revise the "no action" alternative with monitoring to a no action alternative.

RESPONSE

Agreed. Monitoring in the no action alternative **has** been deleted from the **no** action alternative.

U.S. Navy

COMMENT:

Revise the engineering costs to include costs for the **Remedial** Action Contractor at the following amount. Alternative **1** — no costs, Alternative **2** — \$50,000, Alternative **3** — \$50,000, and Alternative **4** — \$100,000. These costs include a site visit by the Remedial Action Contractor and document development.

RESPONSE:

Agreed. The above listed costs have been included.