

N00207.AR.003473  
NAS JACKSONVILLE  
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 9 FEBRUARY 1994 MEETING TO DISCUSS OPERABLE UNIT 3 (OU 3)  
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION FEASIBILITY STATUS NAS JACKSONVILLE FL  
2/23/1994  
ABB ENVIRONMENTAL

ACC 8-7559

**MEETING MINUTES**

**OPERABLE UNIT 3  
NAS JACKSONVILLE**

DATE: February 23, 1994

DATE OF MEETING: February 9-10, 1994

PLACE: ABB Environmental Services, Inc's Arlington, VA Office

SUBJECT: Operable Unit 3 - RI/FS Work & Project Management Plan Development Review

PREPARED BY: Terry Hall

ATTENDEES:	<u>SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM</u>	<u>ABB Environmental Services, Inc</u>
	Joel Murphy	Peter Redfern
	Dana Gaskins	Conrad Bernier
		Wayne Britton
	<u>USGS</u>	Diane Dopkin
	Bill Andrews	Mark Kauffman
		Terry Hall

PURPOSE: DISCUSS ISSUES RELATING TO PARTNERING MEETING SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY 15-16, 1994

---

**DISCUSSION:**

Initial discussion concerned the agenda for the meeting with the regulators on the RI/FS Work & Project Management Plan development review for Operable Unit 3 - NAS Jacksonville scheduled for February 15-16, 1994 in Atlanta, Georgia. It was decided to develop a revised draft agenda and fax it to the other team members for review before finalization.

Each agenda topic was evaluated for content and structure (i.e., sequence of subtopics and their composition). A copy of the revised agenda as of the end of this meeting is attached. Amplification, as discussed, of some of the topics/subtopics is presented below.

TOPIC

AMPLIFICATION

DAY 1, February 15

Introduction

Discuss the role of USGS during the introduction.

Background of OU3

Scoping Field Program

- Discuss OU3 Physical, Topo, Location

Joel would like to include overheads showing old shoreline, new shoreline, 10 ft. fill line, and where things are today.

- Discuss Previous Field Efforts

Joel requested that overheads from the Summary of Investigative and Assessment Activities at Operable Unit 3 be used to show where past explorations took place.

- Discuss March 1993 Meeting; Preliminary/Initial Response Objectives

Include in the discussion:

- Attendees
- Purpose (prevent "lack of ignorance" during scoping of the RI)
- Additional potential sources (show Appendix A overhead; short and brief)
- P/I response objectives
- Potential Accelerated Threat Response (ATR) remedial actions (RAs) (to be considered for the future)

- Discuss Scoping Field Program

- What occurred
- What still remains today to be done (Joel would like this emphasized)
- Joel's expressed his concern that it be made clear that although there were 40+ original wells, not all are still serviceable; explain clearly the need/reason that additional wells need to be installed. Others (FL/EPA/ Station) have a high degree of concern that OU1 was over-studied but no RI/FS was initiated, and they may want to limit additional data gathering at OU3.

Map the wells in such a way that it is clear and easy to understand the data already collected, where there are data gaps, and why additional wells/samples are needed.

Current Understanding of Site Conditions

- Stratigraphic
- Hydro
- Contamination

Use overheads and findings from the scoping field program.

Discussion ensued whether we would be driving for a definitive consensus at the meeting or an indepth discussion of the objectives for the site; either the reason for the ATRs (purpose of the current field program plan) or a full scale RI/RA.

DAY 2, February 16

Although we need to tie the existing data with the remaining useable wells and the need for additional wells, Joel would like the emphasis kept focused on the AOC as OU3, instead of specific locations (i.e, sub-OUs).

Concerning the toxicity numbers (does priority drive action into ATRs), first discuss the decision on the high toxicity/high risk areas, and then identify the specifics. The current approach compartmentalizes the results; instead, discuss the specific site risk and how it affects the overall site.

Proposed RI Field Program Presentation/ Discussion

ABB-ES

Diane discussed the packet to be presented which included the map and proposed sampling points showing six different ways of dividing up the site. She used historical and ABB-ES scoping field program data for GW to help her define the problem areas. Her approach is to do more CPT sampling to better identify source info.

Joel's comments:

- Need grid for DPTs for the area to determine placement of wells.
- Suggested doing some soil DPTs (as screening tool) in same area to determine where to put wells.
- Abandon NARF2 and D2 wells (has oil in it) and replace with new wells.
- Need to add well between NARF 4 and NARF 12 (a deep well).
- Wants cost comparison between onsite lab and offsite lab submitted to him within two weeks.

Conrad commented that in addition to knowing what is leaving the site, it is also important to know where nothing is leaving the site.

Joel's comments:

- Be strategic with DPT grid and depths.
- Towards the south, use more DPTs to determine gross amount of contamination that exists then bound wells strategically.
- Do whatever is necessary now to define what needs to be done in order to determine where wells need to be installed.
- Intent of scoping was to define a grid extensive enough to determine what needs to be done for confidence factor, rather than installing wells first and then going backwards to DPTs to find plume.
- Wants two contour maps showing upper and lower levels of all hits on TOX chloride. The objective is to point out data gaps for rationale to place additional wells, and to point out serious contamination in some areas.
- Find very simple way of showing what has been found in field work to date, on one picture if possible.

Joel agreed with idea of four TOX chloride maps with colored dots: (1) all numbers, (2) 1x > MCL, (3) 10x > MCL, and (4) 100x > MCL.

It was agreed that at the meeting we should get the group to agree to groundrules for determining placement of DPTs and whether additional wells are needed and where. Joel stated that the sampling regime will be detailed enough to define the plume (grid spacing will vary depending on what is being investigated).

### USGS

Bill presented a chart showing maps of subsections of the GW Flow Path and Water Table Elevation Contours. There were five scenarios related to the seawall and GW restriction to the St. Johns river (a generalized model).

Joel would like him to show a more generalized overlay (utilizing o/heads) of what's coming into OU3, and to do as much as possible before the meeting to refine the model. Bill related that he could do little more but would try and get an overview of the base and more handouts.