102

N61331.AR.000327
NSWC PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

May 6, 1994

Commanding Officer
Wayne Hansel/Code 1856
SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM
P.O. Box 1900010
North Charleston, SC 29419-9010

SUBJECT: MEETING MINUTES FOR CSS PANAMA CITY HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT RISK SCENARIO MEETING.
COASTAL SYSTEMS STATION (CSS), PANAMA CITY, FLORIDA
CONTRACT TASK ORDER NO. 083
CONTRACT NO. N62467-89-D-0317

Dear Mr. Hansel:

The meeting minutes for the CSS Panama City RFI Risk Scenario telephone conference call between SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM, EPA, FDEP, and ABB-ES held on April 22, 1994 are attached for your review.

I have also enclosed a revised copy of the Final Corrective Action Management Plan for your files. Please contact me at (202) 769-8166 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Tracey Kauffman
Associate Project Manager

Attachment

cc: File

ABB Environmental Services Inc.

2120 Washington Boulevard, Suite 300 Tel. (703) 769-8181 Fax (703) 769-8182
Arlington, Virginia 22204

MEETING MINUTES
CSS PANAMA CITY RFI RISK SCENARIO TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
22 APRIL 1994 - 2:00 pm

Personnel in Attendance:

Name	Affiliation	Telephone
Mr. Wayne Hansel	SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM	(803) 743-0615
Mr. Peter Doa	USEPA	(404) 347-3016
Mr. Ted Simon	Mantech	(404) 347-1586
Mr. David Clowse	FDEP	(904) 488-3935
Tracey Kauffman	ABB-ES	(703) 769-8166
Michelle Silkowski	ABB-ES	(703) 769-8149
Anita Pease	ABB-ES	(703) 769-8127
Mark Cheyne	ABB-ES	(703) 769-8121

These meeting minutes summarize the April 22, 1994, Coastal Systems Station (CSS) Panama City Health and Environmental Assessment Risk Scenario telephone conference call between the Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), and ABB-ES. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the proposed human health and ecological risk assessment exposure scenarios and the proposed data management strategy for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 data. The proposed risk scenarios and data management strategies were summarized and presented to USEPA and FDEP in a memorandum dated April 8, 1994.

Agenda/discussions:

Ms. Kauffman of ABB-ES introduced the participants, identified their respective affiliations, and explained the purpose of the conference call.

Mr. Clowse of FDEP indicated that he had been unable to review the exposure scenarios. Ms. Kauffman requested that he review the memo and submit any additional comments to ABB-ES. Mr. Clowse identified John Mitchell as FDEP's reviewer for the ecological risk assessment and requested that he receive a copy of the exposure scenarios. Ms. Pease stated that Mr. Mitchell would be included in the distribution list and that his comments would be incorporated into the final Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation (RFI) report.

Mr. Simon, the USEPA subcontractor support for review of the human health risk assessment, stated that he understood the risk scenario memo to be a workplan for the RFI report. Based on his understanding of what should be included in a workplan, he felt the memo was deficient in describing the tasks necessary to complete the RFI. Ms. Silkowski explained that the memo was not a workplan for the RFI report but rather an oppertunity for ABB-ES to propose human health and ecological risk assessment scenarios for

evaluation in the RFI report. She stated that ABB-ES was trying to achieve a consensus between SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM, EPA, and FDEP on which scenarios were appropriate for each site to ensure agency buy-in upfront.

Mr. Simon began the discussion by noting that Figure 1 was missing SWMU 8. Ms. Kauffman indicated that SWMU 8 will be shown on the facility-wide figure in the final RFI report. She explained that ABB-ES will not resubmit the memo but rather will incorporate all comments into the final RFI report.

Mr. Simon suggested that we clarify how the physical attractiveness of a site is used in the selection of human health exposure scenarios for current land use (pg. A-1). He also suggested that we list the percentage of land dedicated to industrial efforts (pg. A-5). Ms. Siklowski stated that this will be done in the RFI report.

For the scuba divers scenario, Mr. Simon suggested that only adults be evaluated. Further, he indicated that exposures of less than seven years should be used as subchronic RfDs. Ms. Silkowski agreed and stated that the Naval Diving and Savage Training Center will be contacted to determine appropriate exposure parameters for individuals currently exposed to Alligator Bayou.

Mr. Simon asked if ABB-ES plans on using the Region III Risk-Based Concentrations to screen the soils data. Ms. Silkowski indicated that the Region III numbers would be used in the human health risk assessment to select contaminants of potential concern. Ms. Silkowski asked Mr. Simon how the Health-Based Cleanup Goals for DOD Sites, submitted by memorandum from Ligia Mora-Applegate of FDEP (February 14, 1994), were to be used for soils in the RFI. Mr. Simon stated that the Clean-Up Goals should be used in the Remedial Goal Options (RGOs) tables that are required by EPA in the RFI for all those contaminants that are present at concentrations that contribute significantly to an unacceptable risk for soils.

Mr. Clowse stated that ABB-ES should not include risk management discussion in the risk assessment. He stated that ABB-ES should consider all possible scenarios for each site listed in Table 1 of the memo. If an exposure scenario is excluded in the RFI, the rationale for exclusion should be clearly stated. Ms. Silkowski asked Mr. Clowse how many years should be considered in selecting future scenarios. Mr. Clowse indicated that 30 years is sufficient.

Mr. Simon asked why no surface soil samples were taken at SWMU 4. Ms. Kauffman explained that SWMU 4 was proposed for no further action (NFA) in the draft RFI Phase 1 report. She indicated that EPA and FDEP requested that additional surface water and sediment samples be collected at SWMU 4 to verify if NFA is appropriate for this site. She also stated that SWMU 4 consists of a gully which has been filled with concrete construction debris, and that surface soils are not present at this site. Mr. Simon suggested that since

no data is available for soils or groundwater at SWMU 4, that perhaps soil and groundwater data from SWMU 10 could be used as a surrogate for SWMU 4. Ms. Silkowski agreed that the SWMU 10 data will be evaluated and used as a surrogate at SWMU 4 if the data indicates that it would be appropriate (i.e., similar contaminants from historical use of each SWMU).

Mr. Hansel noted that a future residential scenario must be evaluated in the human health risk assessment unless a deed restriction for land use is obtained. Mr. Clowse agreed with this statement.

Mr. Clowse indicated that EPA and FDEP differ with regard to the definition of a surface soil. EPA requires that surface soils be collected from zero to one foot for direct contact purposes whereas FDEP believes that surface soils should be collected from zero to two feet. FDEP believes that the two foot interval corresponds with the depth of soil a child could be expected to dig and come into contact with. Mr. Simon indicated that he thought that two feet is too deep for a child to dig. Ms. Kauffman explained that ABB-ES collected all surface soil samples from zero to one foot based on EPA and FDEP comments received on the draft workplan. Mr. Clowse indicated that ABB-ES should use the surface soil data collected from the zero to one foot range for the RFI report. It was emphasized that FDEP should make its position on surface soils known once FDEP upper management has made a decision on the range of sample collection. Mr. Simon indicated that Elmer Aiken of Region 4 EPA and Ligia Mora-Applegate of FDEP should discuss the surface soil issue and come to a consensus. Mr. Clowse agreed.

Mr. Clowse asked if ABB-ES received the information on the new Region IV sediment screening values. Ms. Pease indicated that she had received the new sediment screening values and will use them to select ecological contaminants of potential concern in the sediments.

Mr. Clowse suggested that we send a copy of the exposure scenarios to Mr. John Mitchell for review. John Mitchell may have some valuable input for the ecological risk scenarios. Mr. Hansel added that Nancy Morrison may also want to review the memo. She has been involved in the risk assessment for Key West and may want to review the RFI for Panama City.

Mr. Clowse asked if a piezometric groundwater contour map would be included in the RFI report. Ms. Kauffman indicated that it would be included.

Ms. Silkowski pointed out that particulate exposure for soil would not be evaluated in the RFI report for the human health assessment. Mr. Simon agreed that this was appropriate. Mr. Clowse was uncommitted at this time. Ms. Silkowski also indicated that the inhalation exposure pathway for volatiles derived from soils would not be evaluated. Mr. Simon agreed. Mr. Clowse indicated that FDEP would concur as long as sufficient rational is provided.

Ms. Silkowski asked Mr. Simon his opinion on which exposure pathways need to be addressed for adult exposure to groundwater. Mr. Simon suggested that ingestion of 2 L/day of groundwater should be evaluated for the ingestion scenario. Ms. Silkowski agreed. Mr. Simon further suggested that dermal exposure to groundwater should be considered. He referenced a Dorthy E. Patton memorandum (July 10, 1991) that indicates that exposure to VOCs during showering is equivalent to exposure from ingesting 2 L/day of groundwater. Ms. Silkowski indicated that the dermal exposure pathway would not be pursued for human health based on Region 4 guidance that the Navy CLEAN program has followed in the past, however, ingestion and inhalation of VOCs would be considered. Mr. Simon commented that if high VOCs are present in groundwater, that ingestion and inhalation of VOCs would be appropriate, however, if high SVOCs were present the evaluation of ingestion, inhalation, and dermal scenarios would be expected. Ms. Silkowski disagreed. Ms. Silkowski and Mr. Simon agreed that they would further discuss these issues.

Ms. Kauffman explained the data management strategy for the RFI that was proposed in Attachment B of the memorandum for surface soils, surface water, and sediments. Because surface soil data was not collected during the Phase 1 field investigation, surface soil data from the Phase 2 field investigation will be evaluated for all SWMUs and AOCs. The surface water and sediment samples collected during the Phase 2 investigation were analyzed for the full TCL and TAL scan. In addition, some SW-846 methods were used to obtain lower detection limits for surface water and sediments. Therefore, the Phase 2 data for surface water and sediments will be used in the HEA in the RFI report; the Phase 1 data will be discussed as historical data only.

Mr. Clowse indicated that the groundwater data from both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 field investigations need to be used in the RFI report. Ms. Kauffman stated that ABB-ES's proposed strategy for the use of Phase 1 and Phase 2 data is also summarized in Attachment B. The Phase 1 and Phase 2 subsurface soil and groundwater data will be evaluated on a site by site basis and combined in an appropriate manner. The proposed strategy for integration of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 subsurface soil and groundwater data will be submitted to SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM, EPA, and FDEP once the site-specific evaluation is complete.

Ms. Silkowski solicited opinions on the use of filtered and unfiltered groundwater data. She stated that ABB-ES plans on using the unfiltered data in the risk assessment and the filtered data in the uncertainty section. Mr. Close indicated that FDEP will not consider the filtered data in the human health portion of the RFI. He stated that the filtered data could be used in the uncertainty section but it will not have a large impact on how the groundwater will be evaluated by FDEP. Mr. Simon stated that the RAGS document does not allow the use of filtered data, but that it should be included in an uncertainty section. Mr. Clowse indicated that the RAGS document also provides sampling techniques that minimize the

effect of particulates in the groundwater sample. Ms. Pease pointed out that the ecological risk assessment will be evaluating the filtered data for inorganics only. Filtered samples are used for inorganics because these results represent those contaminants in the dissolved fraction which could potentially discharge to surface water and be biologically available to aquatic life.

Mr. Simon indicated that he would be the EPA reviewer for the human health portion of the RFI. Mr. Clowes indicated that he and Ligia Mora-Applegate will act as reviewers for FDEP during the review cycle.

Mr. Hansel asked if there were any additional comments or concerns. There were none and the meeting ended at 3:30 pm.