

32212-000
22.02.00.0005

**NAS Jacksonville IRP
Program Management Team Meeting**

MINUTES

15 February 1994

Chairperson: James Hudson/USEPA

Members: James Hudson, Kevin Gartland, Bill Raspet, Jorge Caspary, Peter Redfern, Tom Trainor, Joel Murphy, Dana Gaskins

Absent: Miriam Lareau

Tier II Link: Mickey Hartnett, James Malone,

Facilitator: Dick Handrahan

Consultant: Ann-Marie Weaver

Support: Diane Dopkin/ABB-ES, Mark Kauffman/ABB-ES, Wayne Britton/ABB-ES

Visitor: Mitch Cohen/Dynamac Corp., Nancy Bethune/USEPA, Jennifer Herndon/USEPA, Fred Sloan/USEPA, Paul Ina/NAS Jax, Bill Andrews/USGS, Mike Planert/USGS

Meeting commenced at 1045, at which time a short discussion was held regarding Partnering issues. Attendees listed how they felt about this meeting being a Partnering meeting; the attitude they came with; what goals they wanted met; work rules. The Partnering ground rules were reviewed before the technical meeting began.

Dick Handrahan went over an organizational model: 1) Pioneers-making way; 2) Settlers-playing it safe/doesn't commit/low energy; 3) Outlaws-always going against the grain/disagree with the goal.

The meeting was turned over to the Chairperson: James Hudson of the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Operable Unit Three

A brief discussion was held regarding the basis for the scheduled site overview. In view of RI Work Plan issues and the fact that some of EPA's supporters are only able to attend today's meeting; Mitch Cohen asked if RI scope could be done first. It was agreed to follow the meeting agenda as presented.

The members reached consensus that before the meeting adjourned on Wednesday they will have decided on the dates for the next Partnering meeting.

Wayne Britton of ABB-ES' Virginia office presented a brief overview of Operable Unit 3 (OU3). He went over the process for developing the OU3 boundaries and what they were originally and what it is presently. Gave a background history of the contaminants and previous site inspections of the industrial area. In 1985 eight monitoring wells were installed with recommendations for an expanded site investigation (ESI). In 1986 during the ESI an additional twelve wells, two of which were deep wells, were installed.

Crossconnections of the sewer, water and industrial wastes lines were done in 1988. At that time twenty-four soil borings (9'-13' deep) were drilled with 14 being converted to temporary monitoring wells were installed. Wells were removed when sewer construction was initiated.

In 1989 Building 795 was investigated for a potential health risk; six soil borings were done with one being converted to a temporary monitoring well, which was destroyed when construction began.

While in the process of installing a closed loop system from Building 780 in 1990; five additional soil borings were done, two were converted into temporary wells which were destroyed. The wells showed high hits in the Building 780 area. Forty-four soil borings were done in 1991 in the unsaturated zone; in 1992, nine additional soil borings were completed.

The P615 investigation commenced in the spring of 1992, in preparation for a hazardous waste minimization for waste water discharge. Six soil borings/temporary wells installed/destroyed.

An attempt to construct a Helo wash rack prompted the 1993 P159 investigation. Twelve soil borings were done and seven of these were converted into permanent monitoring wells.

Building 101's UST investigation in 1993 had fifteen soil borings and four permanent monitoring wells.

ABB-ES conducted a scoping study at OU3 in July of 1993: twenty-seven piezometers; two soil borings; and sixty-three cone penetrometer probes (with groundwater samples) were completed.

ABB-ES took a well inventory of the OU3 area; the majority are shallow wells. Two wells have approximately a half foot of product (some of which is waste product dumped by NADEP personnel). The Installation will take immediate action on the wells containing product. Some of the wells have been damaged and are unusable.

Southern Division explained that the scoping investigation was to develop data and access the information in regards to possible remedies (threat reduction-source removal) and to help in writing the RI Work Plan for OU3. The wells installed during the scoping effort have not been sampled; only used for water levels to date.

Drilled two 150' soil borings during the effort; there are disputes as to where the Hawthorn is, ABB-ES did continuous spilt spoons to 150 feet.

Sixty-three CPT probes were sampled and for those along the OU#3 boundary if high concentrations encountered ABB-ES stepped out and conducted another probe. The dry cleaners area had hits of TCE and is now included within the OU3 boundary. The cleaners has had a closed loop system for the past three years; disposal before that time is unknown.

Tier II/Mickey Hartnett interrupted and gave an overview of how the technical meeting is a partnering meeting and the two go together. Partnering is the how to; technical is the what.

Adjourned for lunch.

Diane Dopkin of ABB-ES' Virginia office gave an overview of the site geology. She explained that NAS Jacksonville has three aquifers: 1) Floridan, 2) intermediate, and 3) Surficial. A large portion of OU3 is comprised of hydraulic fill from the St. Johns River.

Discussed the irregularities of the clay lenses; it is shallow on the North end of the Station and deeper on the Southeast end. The CPT data found the clay layer to be inconsistent. More of a defined layer at the North end of the site. Highest concentrations found in the upper twenty feet (15' to 20' bls is considered

to be an upper layer). Scoping effort showed that the clay does not appear to obstruct the flow of contaminants.

Explained the fence diagram and discussed the various characteristics of the encountered clay layers. Black organic clay was detected at three locations. The clay layers and their inconsistencies will be addressed during the RI/FS.

The seawall (17 feet in depth) diverts the groundwater flow from the station. There is not a significant affect in the groundwater flow/levels caused by tidal influence. Two groundwater mounds were discovered during the scoping effort and will be investigated further.

United States Geological Survey

USGS explained the software capabilities that is used for groundwater modeling at NAS Jacksonville. A handout (Attachment A) was passed out, which presented specific procedures, nodes, aquifers, and features for OU3. It also gives examples of the groundwater flow directions with and without the seawall. The seawall causes a damming effect and flows mostly to the south end of the wall.

Hydraulic conductivity testing is scheduled to be completed the week of 14 February 1994; aquifer testing will be executed during the OU3 RI/FS.

Streamlining the RI/FS Process

James Hudson introduced Fred Sloan of the USEPA, who presented a brief overview on how to streamline the RI/FS process.

Facilitator states that this may be something to think about doing at NAS Jax.

See Attachment B for the Streamlining the RI/FS Process proposal.

Fred broke down the process steps for streamlining the RI/FS Process; he interjected that while the RI field work is in progress team members could hold conference calls to make changes/quick decisions so that field efforts are not delayed.

Tier II interrupts: Stated that EPA and DOD are trying to have this process implemented.

FDEP stated that if the RI and FS are overlapped then the FS team could receive critical information from the field during the RI process. The RI and FS could feed off of each other and by doing it this way it could assist in preventing the possibility of additional field work. FDEP stated that they have preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) for soils; EPA has numbers (not finalized) regarding the level of clean-up so the RI/FS can be focused during the entire process.

Several team members stated that NAS Jacksonville has essentially already been doing this.

Facilitator interrupts: Time warning, some members cannot work past 5:00 pm.

FDEP and Southern Division would like to implement the real time response at Nas Jax; conference calls would be a first step.

OU3 has a good start for a PRG list. During the scoping study only ten percent of the samples were sent to a NEESA approved laboratory requesting a full TAL/TCL scan using standard detection limits. During RI 24 hour turn around can be requested. It was pointed out that it would be helpful if the PRG list was finalized before the RI field work commenced. Could possibly use a mobile field laboratory for Level II

analyses sending ten percent of the samples to a NEESA approved laboratory for confirmation, which, in turn, would be used for risk assessment purposes. The area could be screened with Level II data and confirmed with Level III data-only results.

Agenda for Wednesday

8:00 - 9:00 Site Contaminants/ABB-ES

9:00 - 10:00 Risk Assessment/EPA

10:00 - 10:15 Break

Then continue as scheduled reads. Members will decide when/where/time of next meeting before departing on Wednesday.

Facilitator: Wanted to see if everyone's goals were met.

Tier II asked if the team members wanted to see the same Tier II at each meeting or if they preferred them to rotate? Team stated that either way was fine.

Facilitator: Thanked all the speakers and the team members for the discipline they displayed.

**NAS Jacksonville IRP
Program Management Team Meeting**

MINUTES

16 February 1994

Chairperson: James Hudson/USEPA

Members: James Hudson, Bill Raspet, Jorge Caspary, Peter Redfern, Tom Trainor, Joel Murphy, Dana Gaskins

Absent: Miriam Lareau, Kevin Gartland

Tier II Link: Mickey Hartnett, James Malone,

Facilitator: Dick Handrahan

Consultant: Ann-Marie Weaver

Support: Diane Dopkin/ABB-ES, Mark Kauffman/ABB-ES, Wayne Britton/ABB-ES, Greg Beumel/ABB-ES

Visitor: Jack Harrington/Dynamac Corp., Nancy Bethune/USEPA, Paul Ina/NAS Jax, Bill Andrews/USGS, Mike Planert/USGS, Dr. Elmer Aiken/USEPA

Facilitator stated that the meeting should start on time, even though some of the members were late.

Wayne Britton discussed the list of contaminants found at OU3. Total chlorinated VOCs were detected in the groundwater; TCE and its breakdown products. TCE found at two locations had elevated readings of 100,000 ppm. The chlorinated VOCs found in the groundwater were detected at various levels.

The battery pit has not been tested for lead and metals; that should be addressed during the RI. EPA expressed concerns regarding metals; Southern Division replied that VOCs were more important.

During the scoping effort the samples were screened for Federal and State MCLs. Maps showing depths and locations were displayed. VOCs were taken from above the clay layer, in the middle, and below the layer. The higher concentrations were found at Building 780, the dry cleaners, and P615. Hot spots at Building 780 were found in depths between 20' and 60'.

TPH was detected near the old test cell. EPA wanted to know if it could have gotten there from an old monitoring well, but there is nothing to confirm that there was one in that area.

Risk Assessment Discussion

Received hits of carbon disulfide; to the knowledge of the Station it has never been utilized.

Zero to twenty foot - Surficial

EPA inquired as to the levels of sampling; ABB-ES responded that they were surficial, 80' would be the deepest sampled and 150' was for lithology. The majority of the monitoring wells are at a depth between 9' and 15'. That is why 0' to 20' samples were taken.

There were a few areas on the Station where TPH and/or Benzenes were detected and on the map they were red dots with a circle around them. The red dot at the South end of the Station could possibly be toluene. The Installation stated that there is a 25,000 gallon underground storage tank (UST) that is leaking, which could be the cause of the problem.

Vinyl chloride was detected in the samples sent to the NEESA approved laboratory; did not have that capability at the onsite field laboratory. The samples sent to the offsite laboratory were a random selection.

Twenty to sixty foot - Mid-level

Mid-level did not receive an abundance of hits. Samples were screened against Region III's tap water/ambient water criteria.

Team needs to develop a list of PRGs; it needs to drive the OU3 RI/FS.

ABB-ES is trying to write the Work Plan and have the hows/whats and ways to identify actions so it incorporates a complete impact on risk. Ideally, it would be to have the risk paralleling the RI/FS.

OU3 is media specific: heavy Industrial area, subsurface and groundwater.

Scoping event only conducted a full scan of constituents in certain areas. The RI will do a full scan of the entire area.

Possibility to down scale the risk assessment if Florida MCLs are used, because of it being an industrial area. Team needs to decide which way to go, residential or industrial. NAS Jacksonville is a Class 2 aquifer and the St. Johns is an ecological habitat. Groundwater flow discharges into the St. Johns at the Southeast end of the Station. The sediment of the St. Johns has not been sampled at this time.

Will put upgradient wells North of the Station for background purposes; this will help in setting background information for the Installation.

FDEP informed team members that there is a new Free From list for groundwater developed in December 1993. Team has to decide which list to use 1989's or 1993's. Use 1989's and consider 1993's as to be considered (TBC); only five (5) chemicals were added. Need to come to a conclusion as to how to drop chemicals from the list of contaminants of concern at OU3 depending on detection limits found. Also, come to a conclusion regarding iron and calcium.

EPA showed a flowchart that would be helpful.

Hit list:	Everything found on site
COPC: (Contaminates of Potential Concern)	Very conservative list (10^{-6} ; HI - 0.1; 5% not absolute rule)
TCC: (True Contaminates of Concern)	What needs remediation

EPA does not require cleaning up beyond background. Background needs to be addressed; it is very critical, military installations are different then anything else.

Greg Beumel proposed a how to for OU3's risk assessment; instead of assuming-build a total contaminants list up front before RI/FS is started. Background needs to be addressed before list is formed.

During Phase II of OU1's investigation, monitoring wells were installed at twenty-eight (28) locations throughout the Station; sampled for water and soil. This will help in deciding the background. OU3 has 10' to 20' of fill in some areas; a sample taken North of OU3 (fill area which is considered to be virgin fill) could be analyzed and considered to be background for the NADEP area. Then propose to the agencies what the background of the Station is; if contaminants are below the Station background remediation would not be required.

ABB-ES would like to propose a risk based boundary based on the geographical areas of contaminants. EPA noted that the barracks need to be addressed for known and unknown sources - "reasonable sampling" needs to be done in this area. ABB-ES stated that the barracks area would probably be addressed during the RRDS investigation. Dr. Aiken said if that is the case then ABB-ES would have a complete BLRA; mentioned that the team might want to use the barracks area as possible background data.

Scoping effort only required a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP). The purpose of this effort was to determine the boundaries and identify the contaminants of concern; so ABB-ES could have a more precise understanding of the operable unit, and be able to write a complete RI/FS Work Plan.

Soil samples were taken only from the piezometers; not the CPT probes. EPA informed team that there is not a method for soil flow. Tests need to be done, EPA will work with team to devise analytical/sampling methods for this purpose.

When groundwater contaminants are greater than the MCLs; possible leaching will need to be addressed. Standards need to be met throughout soil and groundwater. FDEP has a list for target clean up levels for soils. The numbers are based on default values, but can calculate from base numbers. If questions concerning the numbers; might get locked in, numbers may be below would need to address this up front and try to change them. FDEP is willing to change the numbers for this site.

ABB-ES gave an overview on the soils and groundwater media and discussed remedial technologies. These technologies can be used for interim actions; also help to excellerate/help to direct the RI. The technologies were derived from the list of constituents found during the scoping effort and their breakdown structures. Bio is an enhancement. Metals would be remediated either before or after as a polishing type. FS data requirements and parameters could be included in this list to alleviate additional field work.

Concerns about radioactive waste. It will be addressed during the radiological survey for the specific areas on the Station. This will be done in the early Spring (is a modification to OU1). Radium could be a hazardous during the treatment system phase not necessarily the field investigation. The survey will be finishing up as the Draft Work Plan is issued for review. The Final Work Plan will include the findings of the radiological survey.

Facilitator interrupts to introduce Jack Harrington an EPA Contractor. Group goes to lunch-team members stay to discuss the date and time for next Partnering Meeting.

The next Partnering meeting will be March 16th and 17th, in Jacksonville; the Chairperson will be either Miriam or Joel. Bill and Kevin will see if the Catholic Retreat is available and let Ann-Marie know the specifics so it can be included in the minuetts.