



PARK WEST TWO  
CLIFF MINE ROAD  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15275-1071  
(412) 788-1080

5/1/89-<sup>B</sup>  
04421

6243

May 1, 1989

NUS Project Number 7095

Mr. George Radford  
Building 198  
Stop 1  
Facilities Directorate  
NREA Department, Code LN  
MCAS, Cherry Point, North Carolina 28533-5000

Subject: TRC Meeting Minutes  
Marine Corps Air Station, North Carolina  
Contract Number N62470-84-C-6886

Dear Mr. Radford:

Attached please find the Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting minutes from the meeting held April 19, 1989 at MCAS, Cherry Point, North Carolina. Andrew Kissell (Atlantic Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command) has provided comments on the draft meeting minutes and these comments have been incorporated herein. Please contact me if you would like to make any revisions or additions. If not, please distribute the minutes (under a Department of the Navy cover letter) to the meeting attendees.

Please contact Ms. Vicki Pierce or me at (412) 788-1080 with any questions or comments you may have.

Sincerely yours,

*Linda Klink*

Linda Klink

LK:bpk

Attachments

cc: Andrew Kissell

MEETING MINUTES  
 TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC) MEETING

FOR

THE INSTALLATION RESTORATION (IR) PROGRAM

LOCATION: MCAS, Cherry Point, North Carolina  
 Facilities Maintenance Department Conference  
 Room, Bldg. 87

DATE: April 19, 1989

ATTENDEES:

Andrew Kissell	Atlantic Div.Nav.Fac. Eng. Com.	(804) 445-2931
Nina Johnson	Atlantic Div.Nav.Fac.Eng.Com.	(804) 444-8045
Dwayne Cormier	Atlantic Div.Nav.Fac.Eng.Com.	(804) 445-2932
George Radford	NREA, MCAS Cherry Point	(919) 466-4598
Doug Nelson	NREA, MCAS Cherry Point	(919) 466-3631/4186
Glenn Hartzog	NREA, MCAS Cherry Point	(919) 466-4598/4599
Jane Patarcity	NUS Corporation	(412) 788-1080
Linda Klink	NUS Corporation	(412) 788-1080
Vicki Pierce	NUS Corporation	(412) 788-1080
Jack Butler	North Carolina Superfund Branch	(919) 733-2801
Richard R. Powers	N.C. - NR & CE - DEM	(919) 946-6481
Dick Denton	N.C. - NR & CD - DEM	(919) 946-6481
Shannon Maher	U.S. EPA	(404) 347-7603
John Lank	U.S. EPA - RCRA	(404) 347-7603
Henry Sermons	County of Craven/Havelock	(919) 636-6608

MEETING NOTES;

0830-0840 - Welcome

- o Doug Nelson, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs (NREA), provided the introduction. He emphasized that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Installation Restoration (IR) program and the sites being investigated relative to that program.
- o George Radford, NREA, provided the agenda.

0840-0900 - Overview Navy/Marine Corps Installation  
Restoration (IR) Program

- o Nina Johnson, Dept. of Navy, provided an overview of the Navy IR Program. Major points of discussion were as follows:
  - Technical Review Committee (TRC) meetings and their purpose
  - Differences in terminology between the Navy IR Program and the EPA CERCLA Program. (Ms. Johnson noted that prior to 1986 the Navy Program was referred to as "NACIP" -Navy Assessment and Control of Installation Pollutants Program and post-1986 a conversion was made to the EPA CERCLA terminology. A glossary handout was provided.)
  - The Initial Assessment Study (IAS) for MCAS Cherry Point, which identified 21 suspected sites and recommended 14 of the sites for additional study was discussed.
  - Department of the Navy, Atlantic Division, versus NREA responsibilities.

0900-1120 - Review of Remedial Investigation (RI) Interim  
Report

- o Vicki Pierce, NUS Corporation (NUS), briefly summarized the recommendations for the 14 sites identified in the IAS. Ten of the sites (discussed by Vicki Pierce) were recommended for either deletion, additional monitoring, or referral to another Navy program, while four of the sites (discussed later by Linda Klink) require additional investigation. Refer to Attachment 1 of this letter for a summary of the sites and the related recommendations.
- o Background information was provided on MCAS, Cherry Point geology and hydrogeology, and NADEP wastes which are potential/alleged site contaminants. Also, it was discussed that 3 rounds of sampling were conducted; and that analysis became more detailed and QA/QC more stringent in proceeding from Round 1 to Round 3.
- o For each site, well placement rationale, sample collection and analysis, toxicological evaluation, and recommendations were discussed. Summary handouts were provided for each site. All those attendees designated as TRC members had the Remedial Investigation (RI) Interim Report which was issued in November 1988.

The following comments/questions were raised:

Sites 1 & 2 Borrow Pits

- Vicki Pierce summarized that these sites were deleted because contaminant concentrations were low. Also, the sites were greater than 30 years old, relatively few contaminants were detected, and the frequency of contaminants detected was minimal.
- Nina Johnson noted that these areas were auxiliary landfills. The site 10 landfill was the main disposal area.
- Richard Powers asked if seeps were present at the site and Vicki Pierce responded that it was difficult to tell because the areas were marshy.
- Shannon Maher asked about the inorganics detected and Vicki Pierce responded that the levels detected may reflect background conditions. Doug Nelson noted that the USGS report provides background levels of metals in groundwater and that dumping was indiscriminate.
- Shannon Maher asked why the wells were 25 feet in depth. Vicki Pierce responded that this was a Navy request for Round 1 investigation as recommended in the IAS, and, where appropriate, well depth varied for Rounds 2 and 3 investigation. DNAPL (Dense nonaqueous product layer) was not found, nor were concentrations of chemicals detected indicative of its presence.
- Jack Butler asked about the MCAS potable water wells and it was noted that Figure 6-2 on page 6-34 of the Interim RI Report showed these well locations. Doug Nelson noted that the USGS preliminary report correlated well with the NUS study of potable wells. George Radford said that a computer model was planned for the purpose of new potable well placement and a salt water encroachment study. Richard Powers asked about four new potable wells that he was aware of and Doug Nelson replied that they were not yet installed, but were to be located near Roosevelt Boulevard.

Site 4 Borrow Pit/Landfill

- Vicki Pierce summarized that periodic monitoring was recommended at this site due to the one-time detection of 38 ppb of TCE. She noted that downgradient wells were not affected.

- Doug Nelson noted that this site is still in use. George Radford added that a manned checkpoint is in place to ensure that only construction debris is landfilled. Vicki Pierce added that this system has been in place since at least 1982.
- Shannon Maher asked whether monitoring of surface water was planned. Vicki Pierce said no and that volatiles, such as TCE were not detected in surface water.
- Shannon Maher asked where dumping is now occurring. Vicki Pierce replied that dumping is occurring throughout the site but that the 4GW04 area, where TCE was detected, is on the site boundary. Richard Powers added that the one-time high TCE concentration that was detected in 4GW04 could be a slug from a can of solvent, etc. Vicki Pierce added that it could also be from laboratory contamination. Nina Johnson noted that other volatiles are also present in 4GW04, but no problem exists with wells further downgradient of the site. Richard Powers asked about a possible upgradient source and Vicki Pierce responded that a treed area was located upgradient. Richard Powers also commented that additional wells in the vicinity of 4GW04 might be needed.
- Shannon Maher asked if background samples were taken. Vicki Pierce gave a negative reply. Doug Nelson cited a coop study on the Slocum Creek Watershed of 1500 samples which were surprisingly clean.

Sites 6 & 7 Fly-ash Ponds/Old Incinerators and Adjacent Area

- Vicki Pierce recommended deletion of these sites based on analytical results demonstrating low levels of contamination.
- Doug Nelson added that Luke Rowes Gut is the main drainage pathway for the MCAS.
- Jane Patarcity noted that although phenolics were detected, phenols were not found when analyzing for priority pollutants.
- Vicki Pierce said that Site 6 is still active and George Radford added that Site 7 was not active.
- Doug Nelson indicated that the data bank on sediment analysis showed these two sites to be noncontaminated.

Site 13 - Tank Farm A

- Vicki Pierce recommended that this site be referred to the Navy UST Program for additional investigation as a fuel oil layer and other volatile organics were detected in the groundwater.
- Doug Nelson said that the matter of replacing the four large underground tanks with aboveground tanks was still unresolved.
- Nina Johnson indicated that continued study for Site 13 was planned for the next fiscal year.
- Andrew Kissell noted that this site is more relative to the UST Program than the IR Program.
- George Radford noted that work at several tank farm areas is ongoing.

Site 15 - Area and Ditch behind NADEP

- George Radford indicated that the Drum Storage Area was being handled under a RCRA Closure Plan.
- Andrew Kissell asked whether runoff originated from the runways or from NADEP. Doug Nelson replied that both were responsible.
- Richard Powers asked about the 0.001 ug/l for phenolics given as the North Carolina Water Quality Standard on Table 8-6 of the Interim RI Report. This is an error and should read 0.001 mg/l.
- Andrew Kissell asked in what form the metals were bound. Jane Patarcity replied that it can't be determined from the given analysis.
- John Lank asked about lead levels in sediments and Jane Patarcity responded that the levels were typical of urban runoff.
- Vicki Pierce, in conclusion, added that additional investigations to be conducted at Site 16 may provide additional information on groundwater flow direction in this area. Also, it was emphasized that the PCB sediment (downstream) concentration of 6.9 ppm is suspected to be related to Site 17.

Site 18 - Facilities Maintenance Compound

- Vicki Pierce recommended deletion of this site.
- Richard Powers asked if any other parameters besides PCBs were analyzed. Vicki Pierce responded that only PCBs were investigated. George Radford said that soil gas activities to be conducted for Site 16 would include the Site 18 vicinity.

Site 19 & 21 Landfill

- Vicki Pierce recommended deletion of Site 19 and periodic sampling of the Site 21 wells.
- Shannon Maher asked about dashed lines on the general arrangement and it was answered that the lines represented drainage swales.
- Richard Powers asked if it was possible that phenolic compounds at Site 19 were coming from wood rubble. Jane Patacity replied yes.
- For Site 21, George Radford indicated that a monitoring well downgradient of the sludge application area may support deletion of this site. Richard Powers mentioned that North Carolina State requirements call for permitting of new wells; the process of issuing a permit takes 15 days.

## 1120-1200 - Review of Remedial Investigation (RI) Interim Report (cont.) and Review of Work Plan

- o Linda Klink, NUS, explained that she would be discussing the 4 sites requiring additional work; sites 5, 10, 16, and 17. For each site, a presentation of work conducted to date (RI Interim Report) was followed by a presentation of planned work (Draft Work Plan). Summary handouts were provided for each site. The full Draft Work Plan was also distributed. None of the attendees had prior access to the Draft Work Plan, as it was issued April 14, 1989.
- o For each site, well placement rationale, sample collection and analysis, toxicological evaluation and recommendations were discussed. For the Work Plan presentation, data gaps were discussed. The additional work to be performed at these sites will be conducted in two phases. Phase I activities were discussed in detail. (Phase II was discussed in general terms, as it will require a separate Work Plan. The scope of Phase II work is dependent on Phase I results.)

The following comments/questions were raised:

Site 5 - Storage Tanks for Waste Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricant (POL)

- Richard Powers discussed action limits for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH). The May 1988 edition of the California Method for determining TPH content (modification of EPA method) should be used for all future analysis. If the results are 10-100 ppm, then cleanup levels are negotiable. If the results are more than 100 ppm, then treatment is mandated.
- Linda Klink raised the issue of Appendix IX analysis requested by the State for soil sampling related to closure of Tank 1771. George Radford said that he will pursue this issue with the State and would prefer full TCL analysis as recommended in the NUS Draft Work Plan.
- Richard Powers asked about "advanced soil gas methods." Linda Klink described the method used by the potential subcontractor Petrex. Petrex uses activated carbon for adsorption, with subsequent analysis for selected volatile contaminants. It was noted that the planned contaminants to be tracked for each site were selected based on past analytical results, or suspected occurrence. At Site 5, PCBs cannot be tracked directly as they are not volatile. However, compounds recommended are indicative of waste POL, which also contains the PCBs.

1200-1315 - Lunch

1315-1400 - Windshield Tour of Sites 5, 10, 16, and 17

1400-1540 - Review of Remedial Investigation (RI) Interim Report and Review of Work Plan (cont.)

- o Linda Klink, NUS Corp. continued the presentation. The following comments/questions were raised:

Site 10 - Old Sanitary Landfill

- Shannon Maher asked about the definition of clean and contaminated for Site 10 wells shown on Figure 6-1 of the RI Interim Report. Linda Klink replied that clean did not imply no detection, but implied that concentrations were not indicative of contamination.
- Shannon Maher asked about PCB analysis at Site 10. PCBs were present in leachate sediments yet no additional PCB analysis of sediments were planned. Linda Klink/Vicki Pierce/Jane Patarcity were unsure whether this analysis should be added as it most likely will not provide any new information.

Site 16 - Landfill at Sandy Beach

- Andrew Kissell asked about well placement as related to the conduct of soil gas and whether wells should instead be pursued as part of Phase II. Linda Klink responded that the source of contamination is unknown. Four wells were required as a minimum for Phase I, and Phase II may require additional wells. Soil gas alone cannot be used to verify contamination or the extent of contamination, particularly in a paved area such as this. Richard Powers added that the State would agree, and the planned upgradient well was a necessity. (As verified in the Interim RI Report, Well 16GW01, the original upgradient well, was found to be contaminated.)
- Linda Klink noted that the Facilities Maintenance building, a potential source of contamination, is shown in the wrong location on the Draft Work Plan figures. The actual location should be south of "A" Street and west of Cunningham Boulevard.

Site 17 - Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO)

- John Lank recommended that samples be collected by Shelby tube rather than the hand auger method, in order to obtain more accurate samples representative of the sampled depth.

## 1540-1545 - Overview of Public Affairs in the IR Program

- Tamara Skipton (2nd Lt.), MCAS, Cherry Point, provided a brief presentation and handouts describing the public affairs plan, as well as a sample community relations plan, for the investigation and possible clean-up of past hazardous waste disposal sites on Naval properties.

## 1545-1550 - Conclusion

- Nina Johnson indicated that the Navy would send meeting minutes to all attendees. The attendees will have 30 days to respond to the Remedial Investigation (RI) Interim Report and the Draft Work Plan. She emphasized that the Navy is anxious to receive comments so that work can proceed this summer on Phase I of the Draft Work Plan.

## ATTACHMENT 1

## REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION INTERIM REPORT SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Site	Recommendations
1&2. Borrow Pits	Delete
4. Borrow Pit/Landfill	Sample wells quarterly
5. Storage tanks for waste petroleum, oil, and lubricants	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
6&7. Fly-ash ponds/old incinerators and adjacent area	Delete
10. Old Sanitary Landfill	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
13. Tank Farm A	Refer site to Department of Navy UST Program for Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
15. Area and ditch behind NADEP	Delete
16. Landfill at Sandy Branch	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
17. Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO)	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
18. Facilities Maintenance Compound	Delete
19&21. Landfill	Delete Site 19. Sample Site 21 wells quarterly