



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 6  
1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200  
DALLAS, TX 75202-2733

APR 29 1998  
RECEIVED

April 29, 1998

*Site -  
Please find  
comments to HAFB  
by 6/5/98 or forward  
to EPA w/ notice rule  
by same date  
Gandy  
5/5/98*

Mr. Benito Garcia, Chief  
New Mexico Environment Department  
Hazardous and Radioactive Materials Bureau  
2044A Galisteo St.  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

**Re: Review of the HAFB Draft Final Phases I & II RFI Report for Site AOC-1001, EPA I.D. No. NM6572124422**

Dear Mr. Garcia:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has completed a technical review of the Holloman Air Force Base (HAFB) Draft Final Phases I & II RFI Report for Site AOC-1001 submitted January 8, 1998, and has determined that parts of the Report are deficient and enclosed is a list of deficiencies.

Even though the RFI investigation collected additional information, the source of contamination was not found. HAFB has committed to continue the investigation.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Mr. Allen T. Chang of my staff at (214) 665-7541.

Sincerely yours,

*for* David W. Neleigh, Chief  
New Mexico/Federal Facilities  
Section

Enclosure

**NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY**  
**Holloman Air Force Base (HAFB)**  
**Phases I & II RFI Report for Site AOC-1001**

1. Page 2-2; Figure 2-1: Does the buried pipeline extend southward? Please include the remaining southern portions of the buried pipeline in the Figure. Where did the pipeline end? How deep was the pipeline buried? Did Holloman conduct leak sampling activities underneath the pipeline? **(Best Professional Judgement (BPJ))**
2. Page 2-3; 3rd paragraph: It states, "Circular features which appeared to be tank berms of above ground storage tanks (ASTS)..." Have they been investigated during the RFI for Tables I SWMUs? **(BPJ)**
3. Page 2-5; 3rd paragraph: The question regards the four monitoring wells (MWAOC-1 through MWAOC-4). It states, "Soil samples were collected every five feet...etc." Where are the sampling results? Please discuss the results. **(BPJ)**
4. Page 2-13; last paragraph: Please provide any information regarding the "possible sump or oil/water separator", and include in Figure 2-1. **(BPJ)**
5. Page 2-16; 1st paragraph: Were there any soil samples taken from boring DP-22 and where are the results? **(BPJ)**
6. Page 2-19; TABLE 2-6: AOC-1001 GP-22 should be changed to GP-22W because the sample collected was from the redrilled boring adjacent to DP-22. This would be consistent with Figure 2-4. **(BPJ)**
7. Page 2-22; Figure 2-4: Has HAFB had any information and/or investigations regarding the two fuel tanks. How deep were these tanks installed? When the tanks were removed, what kinds of leak tests were performed and how was the soil sampled (locations and sampling depth). **(BPJ)**
8. Page 2-29; Recommendations: It is unclear whether the groundwater contamination comes from a single source or multiple sources. EPA believes that Holloman should consider placing another well between MWAOC-4 and MWAOC-2.

It appears from the information submitted that a possible source for groundwater contamination is in the area near the debris pile. Since the groundwater flows toward the northwest direction, Holloman should investigate the west and northwest areas of MWAOC-3, and gather additional information about the nature of the plume. **(BPJ)**

on sheet 2 of 3 sheets

9. Appendix A; Drilling and Well Completion Logs: Soil boring drilling log of DP-09 indicated high PID (38.1 to 97.3<sup>2</sup> ppm) readings in the soil between 15-21 ft. The logger also had a remark of a strong solvent odor at 18 ft. Holloman ~~should~~ *must* further investigate around this boring location. **(BPJ)**

a degree of