

TRC Meeting
 July 31, 1991
 Site 29 - Crash Crew Burn Pit
 Bogue Field, North Carolina

Attendees:

R.D. Nelson (RN)	MCAS, Cherry Point, NC	(919) 466-4598
George Radford (GR)	MCAS, Cherry Point, NC	(919) 466-4598
Renee Henderson (RH)	MCAS, Cherry Point, NC	(919) 466-4598
James Steinberg (JS)	Atlantic Division, Navy	(804) 445-6643
Nina Johnson (NJ)	Atlantic Division, Navy	(804) 445-6643
Rick Shiver (RS)	NC DEHNR	(919) 395-3900
Alfred Anderson (AA)	Carteret County	(919) 393-2109
Kate Looney (KL)	US Fish and Wildlife	(919) 856-4520
Vicki Bomberger (VB)	HALLIBURTON NUS	(412) 788-1080
Matt Cochran (MC)	HALLIBURTON NUS	(412) 788-1080

R. D. Nelson provided introductory notes and a welcome.

George Radford provided an overview of environmental activities for work conducted at the Crash Crew Burn Pit at Bogue Field. The overall environmental process (for multiple sites) was initiated at MCAS, Cherry Point in 1984. (Note: Bogue Field was originally dropped from investigation based on a literature search performed in 1983. In 1988, at EPAs direction, a Site Investigation was conducted)

Comments on the meeting minutes and/or project activities need to be provided within 30 days of receipt of the minutes from this meeting.

The technical presentation was conducted by Matt Cochran (Project Manager, HALLIBURTON NUS).

The Crash Crew Burn Pit consisted of a liquid-filled 50-foot diameter pit with and engine in the center. Tankers located near the pit were used to store flammable liquids that were pumped to the pit and set on fire. Site use was discontinued in 1984 or 1985. The pit area was regraded and vegetated.

RS: Is the pit lined?

GR/MC: No

A series of slides were presented showing the Crash Crew Burn Pit layout when still in use (including tankers that stored waste oil), and after regrading and revegetation of the pit.

RS: What material was put into the pit?

GR: Predominantly JP-5 fuel.

The Site Inspection was conducted in 1988. Field activities included:

- Installation of 4 shallow monitoring wells.
- Collection of 4 groundwater samples (TCL VOCs, TPH, total and dissolved lead, PCBs).
- Collection of 8 soil samples, surface and subsurface (TCL VOCs, TPH, total lead, PCBs).
- Collection of 2 surface water/sediment sample (TCL VOCs, TPH, total lead, PCBs).
- Collection of 1 waste (floating product) sample (total lead, PCBs, GC finger-printing, BTU content, flashpoint).

Limited pre-RI field activities were performed to better prepare for formal field activities to be conducted.

Constituents were detected in all media (refer to presentation handout). Table 1-1, included in the presentation handouts summarizes all analytical results for all media. As constituents were detected in varying concentrations, it was determined that additional investigations were needed to evaluate the site in greater detail.

A preliminary risk assessment was performed to identify data needs for the next investigatory phase (i.e. the Remedial Investigation). This included the preparation of a conceptual model of the site, showing potential migration routes of contaminants.

AA: What are ARARs?

MC: Applicable and Relevant Appropriate Requirements

GR: Basically this includes any standards that have been developed at the Federal, state, and or local level.

AA: South of Route 24, some residents in Carteret County are drinking water from wells as shallow as 15' deep.

RS: I think of greater concern would be discharge to local surface water.

GR: As part of the hazard ranking process, the base located private drinking water wells in a radius of three miles.

NJ: The Navy Clean contractor will be contacting RS shortly, for additional information on private wells, as wells within a 4 mile radius which must be identified.

Table 2-1 in the presentation handout summarizes all contaminant standards and criteria for constituents identified in the SI.

Table 2-3 in the presentation handout summarizes the data requirements for additional investigatory activities at Bogue Field relative to:

- defining extent of contamination
- performing a detailed risk assessment
- evaluating potential remedial (cleanup) actions

RS: The jet fuels are basically kerosene based? As these are naptha based fuels why did you not analyze for semi-volatiles originally? Also the TPH method of 418.1 that is normally used, is not accepted by the state. North Carolina state prefers 5030 for volatiles and EPA 3550 for Total Petroleum Fuel Hydrocarbons (diesels and kerosenes), based on the California guidelines.

MC: Initially we did not analyze for semi-volatiles, however, that is why we are now recommending analysis for semi-volatiles.

RS: What did this site rank? Why is it being studied as an NPL site?

GR: About 20, which would not place it on the NPL. This is a proactive investigation regarding its investigation strategy. In the event that sites would become NPL sites in the future, rework would be avoided as all investigations are being conducted pursuant to EPA CERCLA requirements.

RS: What is TOC and what is the analytical method?

MC: TOC is Total Organic Carbon, analytical method is EPA 415.1.

NOTE: All analytical methods for proposed analyses is provided in the Final RI Planning Document of May 1991.

Proposed investigatory work to be conducted in the next phase was summarized. Recommendation for future work is summarized in the presentation handouts, which also included copies of Figure 2-2 (proposed sample locations) and Table 3-1 (samples and analyses). Additionally, a four inch well is proposed for the center of the burn pit, to be used as a recovery well if necessary.

At this point, there was a general discussion on the floating product detected at the site, the schedule for recovery, etc.

RS: When was the floating product detected?

MC: During the SI field work, which was conducted in the fall of 1990.

RS: The oil spill act (North Carolina Oil Pollution and Hazardous Substances Control Act) and groundwater classification (North Carolina Water Standards) require immediate product recovery, once a product layer is detected. My comment is that the State would like to see recovery as soon as possible. We would probably send the base a letter to that effect.

MC/GR: We will be onsite for the RI field work in the fall of 1991.

GR: We could prepare a letter for you (RS) that details the fact that we are going to be continuing work this fall at Bogue Field.

GR: Will your notice to us be a Notice of Violation (NOV)?

RS: Yes.

MC: If an interim recovery system were put in place, would that meet the requirements of the State.

RS: We just want to see product removed.

VB: The next phase is essentially underway. The contract for the additional work is in place, negotiations for the final price will be conducted in the next two weeks. Final paperwork will be in place approximately 30 days after negotiation.

NJ: The funds have been obligated and were available, i.e. funds will not be an issue in starting the work. We will be onsite drilling mid-October. Drilling will be complete by the end of October. Recovery of product can potentially be initiated in November.

Discussion of the proposed work continued.

RS: What is BTU and why analyze for it?

MC: This analysis basically evaluates how the media will burn, in the event that incineration is evaluated as a remedial alternative.

The presentation was concluded and a general question and answer period was conducted.

RS: How long was this site used?

GR: The site was first used in the mid Fifties

NJ: Does EPA approve of the TPH analysis the state requires.

RS: I don't know. However if you would use the EPA method for soils that were to be disposed offsite, the state would not accept the EPA analysis.

NJ: CERCLA exempts these types of permits for cleanups conducted under CERCLA.

RS: You will need to evaluate/determine who will drive and approve the final cleanup.

CP-80/43-9.04-7/31/91

<u>NAME</u>	<u>COMPANY</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
✓ Jim STEINBERG	LANTDIV	804-445-6643
• Nina Johnson	LANTDIV	804 445-6643
• Vicki Bomberger	HALLIBURTON NUS	412 788-1080
• A W ANDERSON	CARTERET WASTON COUNTY (919)	393 2109
✓ GEORGE PADFORD	NREA HALLIBURTON/ NUS CORP.	919-466-4598/4599
• MATT HEW COCHRAN	NUS CORP.	412-788-1080
• RICK SHIVER	N.C. DIV ENV PLAN	(919) 395-3700
• RENÉE HENDERSON	NREA (MCAS CHERRY PT.	919 / 4666 - 4598
• R. D NELSON	NREA	" " "
Kate Rooney	US Fish and Wildlife Service	919-558-4520