



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
NAVAL TRAINING CENTER  
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92133

AR\_N00247\_000099  
NTC SAN DIEGO  
SSIC NO. 5090.3.A

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090  
010/ **1832**  
JUL 29 1992

Ms. Vickie Church  
County of San Diego  
Department of Health Services  
Hazardous Material Management Division  
P. O. Box 85261  
San Diego, CA 92186-5261

Dear Ms. Church:

We appreciated the opportunity to meet with you on June 18, 1992, to discuss your comments concerning two site investigations in progress at the Naval Training Center. As you recall, at the meeting we discussed comments in your letters dated June 9, 1992, and March 12, 1992, concerning our Building 227 Site Assessment Report and NEX Gas Station Site Investigation Report respectively.

Minutes of the meeting are attached. We will keep you informed and involved in future site investigation with these sites. Future reports will be forwarded to your agency for review.

For further discussion regarding these sites, contact Ms. Martha Gandy, Environmental Engineer, at (619) 524-1022.

Sincerely,

K. S. WEBSTER  
Captain, U. S. Navy  
Chief of Staff

Encl:  
Minutes of Meeting

Copy to:  
RWQCB (Mr. Jim Munch)  
→ SW EFD (Code 18)

18 June 92

MINUTES OF MEETING CONCERNING NAVAL TRAINING CENTER (NTC) SITES:  
(SITE INVESTIGATION (SI) AND SITE ASSESSMENT (SA) FOR NAVY  
EXCHANGE GAS STATION AND BUILDING 227

1. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss comments concerning the Naval Training Center Site Investigation (SI)/Site Assessment(SA) reports recently reviewed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the County Department of Health Services (DOHS). The discussions focussed on comments received in letters from the two agencies. These letters are referred to throughout the minutes and are provided as enclosures.

2. The following persons were present at the meeting:

Martha Gandy (Naval Training Center(NTC))  
LCDR Veselenak (NTC)  
LCDR Citrano (NTC)  
John Heibel (Southwestern Division Naval Facilities Engineering  
Command (SWNAVFAC) Code 18)  
Alan Vancil (SWNAVFAC Code 18)  
Vickie Church (County Department of Health Services Hazardous  
Materials Management Division (HMMD))  
Emad Yemut (CA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC))  
Dennis O'Conner (IT Corp)

3. The following are minutes from the discussions:

a. NEX Gas Station SI/SA HMMD comments (Enclosure (1) HMMD ltr of 12 Mar 92):

- As stated as required in the letter, all wells have been pumped of free product. A Free Product Removal Report was forwarded to HMMD on 15 May 92.

- HMMD ltr states that a complete SA is required to satisfy state requirements. As discussed in this meeting, the Navy acknowledges that more SA work is necessary. The full SA, expected to be complete in FY 93, will contain essential elements as described in the SA checklist included in enclosure (1).

- For future SA work, Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) will discussed in detail in reports and QA/QC plans will be executed completely. Chain of custody documentation for the first SA will be forwarded in the next SA report.

b. NEX Gas Station SI/SA DTSC comments (Enclosure (2) DTSC ltr of 30 MAR 92)

Enc 1 (1)

- A QA/QC Plan will be prepared and followed throughout future SI/SA to ensure that reliable data is used to assess the site.

- Specific comments (1) and (2) from the DTSC letter concerning status of the former Chevron Gas Station were discussed. Investigation of the Chevron Gas Station will be conducted during the historical phase of the SI/SA. The status of Chevron's progress with their contaminated site is not a major concern of the Navy at this stage. If future SI/SA work indicates a correlation between the sources of contamination at NTC and Chevron sites, investigation into Chevron's progress and methodology will be initiated.

- All other specific comments from the letter concern methods used during field work. The methods outlined in the comments of enclosure (2) will be followed as appropriate during the next phase of the SI/SA.

c. Building 227 SI/SA - HMMD Comments (Enclosure (3)) Responses to numbered comments in enclosure (3) are as follows:

(1) The individual listed as the technical reviewer is a registered professional. A signed cover page will be supplied to the HMMD.

(2) The Navy acknowledges that more SA work is required. Groundwater depth will be added to Boring Log (MW-4) and submitted with or before the next site assessment report. Groundwater gradient is presented in the report. The presence of free product in the well is currently being reviewed and will be addressed in the next site assessment report. A clearer statement as to the conditions present at MW-4 is as follows: A leaking UST existed in the area of MW-4; the soil is contaminated; the contamination is suspected to not be migrating; with the removal of the UST, the potential for additional leaking has been negated. These statements are made with the consideration of the soil and groundwater analyses, and the observations made during UST removal.

(3) A revised figure 5.3 will be provided to the HMMD as it was incorrectly plotted.

(4) Copies of pertinent pages of field notes will also be submitted with revised figures and boring logs. The depth of the representative samples taken was based on field observation during the UST removal. Contamination was observed to exist at groundwater table elevation level. Further evaluation showed that the majority of the soil contamination consisted of Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLs). Because DNAPL's have low solubility combined with high density, their mobility exceeds LNAPL's. The sampling depth was chosen as the most characteristic of the situation, and the most beneficial to the Navy.

(5) Currently, a quarterly groundwater monitoring program is in place. The Navy understands that additional delineation of soil and groundwater contamination is necessary. Further site assessment work will be forwarded to appropriate agencies.

(6) The statement regarding dilution of excavated soils is a misnomer. The statement in Section 8, paragraph 2 should read: "This soil was stored on site while 6 mil visqueen was installed to the bottoms of the excavations". Clean soil had to be added to the excavation pit to fill space resulting from tank removal.

(7) As discussed, benzene was detected in very low levels at one location. Ms. Church (HMMD) and the Navy consider the benzene levels to be in trace amounts. Future groundwater samples will be analyzed for benzene, toluene, xylene and ethylbenzene to ensure contaminants are not present or are present at very low levels.

All information stated above to be provided to the HMMD will be provided no later than August 1, 1992.

d. Building 227 SI/SA - DTSC Comments (Enclosure (4))

- The Navy did not intend to "dilute" soil. As stated above, the soil was stored on site while 6 mil visqueen was installed to the bottoms of the excavations". Clean soil had to be added to the excavation pit to fill space resulting from tank removal. No soil mixing occurred.

- Enclosure (4) states that "the Site Inspection Report states that a passive remediation has taken place." This is incorrect. The SI/SA Report states "It is suggested that, in all likelihood, passive remediation has taken place ...". This statement was included in the report only to support the theory that contaminant migration is not presently occurring.

4. The question arose as to whether Building 227 is an Installation Restoration Site. The Navy will investigate this further and communicate the status of this site with appropriate agencies.