

32501.000  
13.03.00.0002

N00204.AR.000083  
NAS PENSACOLA  
5090.3a

MINUTES OF THE SECOND TECHNICAL  
REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING  
NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA  
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA  
JULY 25, 1989

October 1989

Prepared for :

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
SOUTHERN DIVISION  
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND  
2155 EAGLE DRIVE, P.O. BOX 10068  
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29411-0068  
Contract Number N62467-88-C-0200



**ecology and environment, inc.**

1203 GOVERNOR'S SQUARE BOULEVARD, TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301, TEL. 904/877-1978  
International Specialists in the Environment

recycled paper

PREFACE

Prepared for Ecology and Environment, Inc.,  
by Hitchcock and Driver Enterprises, Inc.,  
Court Reporters, Pensacola, Florida.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Held at Naval Air Station Pensacola  
on the 25th day of July, 1989.

HITCHCOCK AND DRIVER ENTERPRISES, INC.  
COURT REPORTERS

Harbourview on the Bay Telephone (904) 434-6447  
25 West Cedar Street Suite 314 434-6773  
P. O. Box 13253  
Pensacola, Florida 32591-3253

CAPTAIN JUPIN: Good afternoon. Welcome to the second of our Technical Review Committee Meetings. As you remember, or may not remember, the first one was in January when we established the TRC and at that particular time we had a general overall review of Pensacola Naval Air Station. What we had done up to that particular point where we knew we had stood and where we thought we were going at that particular time. Then after that, we were going to meet on an as-needed basis, since that time we have had a need to meet so this is the reason we're together today.

As you can see from the agenda up there, we were proposed for the National Priority Listing by the Environmental Protection Agency on the 13th of July, 1989. What this does to us, it initiates the EPA CERCLA Superfund involvement here at the Naval Air Station. That period of public comment, I believe, is about 60 days for the record and then we'll probably be listed. It also starts our development of a Federal Facilities Agreement to be signed between the Federal Facility here at the Naval Air Station Pensacola, Environmental Protection Agency, and the Florida Department of Environmental Regulations. This agreement that is being worked on now, coordinates all

disposal site requirements and actions both under the CERCLA and RCRA side of the house.

As you remember, when we reviewed the program we had our 37 dumps established on board the Naval Air Station. We investigated all of them, but 20 of those in compliance with the EPA at that time were said to require no further study. That left us with 17 to go. However, now that we're under both CERCLA and RCRA, the work project or the work program that you see will in fact cover all 37 sites. It will cover all 37 sites because we're dealing with two separate overlap organizations here and we have to verify the work that we did under one to make sure it covers the requirements of the other side. So when you hear the presentation today you will probably hear about all of those sites, all 37 of them, as a portion of the investigation for the remediation process.

That agreement, as we work on it and pound it out, should be signed sometime in the second quarter of fiscal year '90, which is the January through March time period of '90. And it also--all of our current actions we've got now under the RCRA and hazardous and solid waste amendments, those permit actions that we've got ongoing will continue as they're presently scheduled.

That kind of completes the beginning of the kickoff of this TRC. I'd be glad to answer any questions initially for me. In your packet you should have a news release that we're sending out after this get together today, a copy of the agenda items and a list of the attendees here at this get together, as well. And what else? There was one other thing. We have the Encyclopedia Britannica Plan that we'll pass out later to give everybody a chance. We don't want to tire out your arms carrying this one around right away.

So what I'd like to do now is turn it over to the Ecology and Environment, Incorporated, to have them make a presentation.

JOHN BAKKSDALE: I'm John Barksdale with Ecology and Environment and we're the contractor that's currently working on implementing the remedial investigation here at the sites at NAS Pensacola, Just a minute, I'll have my first overhead on.

Basically what I want to do is just kind of outline the overall program approach that we put together for this. And the way I'd like to do it is by going through the administrative documents that have been generated for this investigation and explain just briefly what each of those entails and going into

a little more detail on it when we get to the work plan, which is the actual document that describes the field investigation. We will start with the administrative documents. The TRC members will be looking at each one of these.

The first I'd like to talk about is the Project Management Plan. This is a plan that's been generated which documents the overall management approach to the investigations, and it outlines the technical approach and includes a tentative schedule for the investigations. This plan also list the qualifications of personnel which will be working on the investigation, E and E or Ecology and Environment personnel. This Project Management Plan is a generic plan, too. I want to back **up** a little bit. Some of these plans **are** generic and others are site specific. This plan is generic which covers all the investigations of all these 36 or 37 sites.

The Project Management Plan also brings **up the** concept of grouping **the** sites together into groups which provide for more efficiency in writing the work plans and implementing the actual field work. I'll discuss the site groupings in just a few minutes.

Another of the administrative documents is the Site Management Plan. That basically **documents**

the investigation objectives. It also identifies applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements or ARARs. This basically just establishes which regulations govern the investigation, which ones apply. It also discusses the need for establishing Data Quality Objectives or DQOs.

Another of the documents is the Quality Assurance Project Plan. This plan is also generic and it documents essentially just the procedures and protocol that will be followed during the entire investigation. It describes the contractor's organization or responsibility of project personnel. It also describes Quality Assurance/Quality Control Objectives in the investigation and describes field work and sampling methodology which will be used in a generic sense. It's a reference document, basically, which the work plans are referenced to. It also describes the analytical procedures which will be used in analyzing the samples which are generated as part of the investigation.

Also the Health and Safety Plan has been generated. This is just another generic plan which describes the health and safety procedures that will be followed during all the field work here at NAS Pensacola.

A Community Relations Plan will exist for this, Ecology and Environment's involvement in this has been to review a Community Relations Plan which was provided to us by the Navy. We had a community relations specialist evaluate it and provide comments back. And I think David has information--

DAVID CRISWELL: **Yeah**, a Community Relations Plan exist for Pensacala, **the** air station, it's been developed by air station personnel. Ecology and Environment's involvement in **the** Community Relations Plan will be to provide assistance as far as interviews with the Community, publishing, actually printing the Community Relations Plan, providing logistical support and public affairs and community relations. So the plan **has** been developed and they're going to augment it with some additional work.

JOHN BARKSDALE: Okay. And finally the investigation **work** plans themselves. These are the documents which are--these are site specific. These describe **the** investigative **approach which** is going **to** be used on a site-by-site basis to perform the field work and the laboratory analysis. In addition to outlining the investigation, it also includes a site specific Health and Safety Plan for the given sites that work plan is describing. That **Health and Safety**

Plan refers back to the generic Health and Safety Plan. It also provides a site specific Quality Assurance Plan which gives any particular QA/QC requirements which exist and that also references back to the Generic Quality Assurance Project Plan.

One feature of the work plans in the whole investigative approach has been to utilize for these investigations a phased approach, which I'll talk about in just a minute.

I'd like to go back for just a minute to the concept of grouping the sites. This is a list of the 37 identified sites and it gives you the site groupings as we perceive this.

I want to talk about the rationale for the grouping of the sites. The TRC members reading the work plan will probably have some questions about that. The reasons that the sites were grouped, as I said before, for efficiency obviously. As many of these that could be grouped and many of these sites that could be addressed in a single work plan would add to the efficiency of generating these work plans.

The sites were grouped on three basic criteria. Sites that were perceived to have similar contaminants or suspected contaminants regardless of their geographic location were put in work plan

groups. Examples of these are for the two work plans, Group D, the two pesticide sites; work plan Group G, the two radium sites; work plan Group I, those are three suspected PCB sites, But that was one set of sites that were grouped together.

Another group of the sites, the way they were grouped was when the sites had just a whole range of possible contaminants which were suspected, nothing really in particular, and say the sites were small, they were grouped together on the basis of geographic location. We tried to put those sites together on the idea was that they'd be most efficient to address in the field like that. And that accounts for sites such as the Group B, that group North Chevalier Disposable areas, Scrag Bins Area, and Supply Department, Outside Storage area; sites similar to that.

Other sites which were large and had, again, a great range of potential contaminants were left alone and were just individual sites made up of group. An example of that is the sanitary landfill, the industrial waste sewer, the pipeline and sites in that order. So essentially that was the rationale for the groupings of these sites.

Also I mentioned the phased approach in the work plans. And before discussing the actual

phased approach, I'd like to give you what the advantages of the phased approach are that allows for -- In doing this in a stepwise fashion, it allows for efficient identification of contaminated sites, sites that are truly contaminated, and it also allows for the early elimination of noncontaminated sites, sites that can fall out of the program early on and there's no sense in spending a bunch of money down the road on some of these that prove early on to be not a hazard.

But also the phased approach allows for focused placement of sampling locations and early parameter selection for later phases. The whole phased approach is basically going from large to small, each phase kind of focuses in on a further area that's indicated by the previous phase. Overall, it allows for efficiency and costs effectiveness while still being able to support evaluation of cleanup alternatives for sites that do require, that are going to require further investigation.

Just to run through the phased approach quickly here. You'll see this in the work plans. Basically phase one is a field screening phase where it involves a general site reconnaissance; it's going out to the site, seeing what's basically there and mapping. It may involve some limited geophysical

surveys, soil and water sampling, an analytical screening method, both in the field and in the laboratory.

The main objective of the phase one is to identify the principal areas and the primary contaminants of concern on a given site. Again, it's a broadbrush look, go out and you see where--if there's a problem, if it focuses you in on a given area. It allows you then to address it in phase 2, which is the characterization of any contamination which is discovered. That involves soil, water, and air sampling, if required. Instead of screening analysis, this is full spectrum laboratory analysis, much fewer samples than is involved in phase one, and the goal of this characterization phase is to characterize and quantify contaminants in those principal areas of concern as identified by phase one.

It's expected that many of the sites may fall out of the program after phase two. A site that doesn't show a significant problem at that point may drop out of the program.

DAVID CRISWELL: I think what we want to point out, and you'll see this when you go through the work plans, is all the sites will be carried through phase one and two and it will go back to what the

Captain was saying earlier about we have 17 sites that the regulatory agencies are requiring us to go and do further studies on. The other 20 sites, we hope to write what is called a "Record of Decision," which will basically write off those sites as no further action; but in order to do that, we have to have some kind of hard engineering data showing that there actually are no contaminants at those sites before we can actually write them off. It may be that once we get to taking samples and looking at those sites that we may have to do further study on into phase three and four with those, but at this point we believe that those 20 sites could be written off and we're going to take them through phase one and two to get that data.

CAPTAIN RILEY: How many sites, you think?

DAVID CRISWELL: Twenty out of the 37 we would hope to write a "ROD" on to eliminate. And 17 were required by RCRA or HSWA permit to do further action under the RCRA Facilities investigation.

JOHN BARKSDALE: And following this, then sites that appear to require further investigation then would go into phase three. And phase three is basically contamination extent delineation. And that, again, involves soil, water,

air, possibly biota sampling, if required. Again, full spectrum laboratory analysis. The goal of phase three, and I might add any additional **phases** -- I mean phases at this point would depend on the findings here. There could be phase four **and** five. But the goal of these phases is to fully define the horizontal and vertical extent of any contamination that's present, in addition to provide a data base which is necessary to support the evaluation of remedial or cleanup alternatives. This is basically it, and as I say, we're in the process and the work plans are ready **for** TRC at this point.

**CAPTAIN RILEY:** Bud, do you know, again, how long you are recommended for the priority list until you actually are put on it?

**CAPTAIN JUPIN:** I think it's **60 days** for--

**DAVID CRISWELL:** Nancy, can you answer as far as comment period **and** formal listing?

**NANCY DEAN:** Well, it depends on who comments on it. If you make a comment It can drag it **out** to a year before it's finally finalized.

**DAVID CRISWELL:** **When** does the comment period close?

**NANCY DEAN:** I think it's **60 days**.

CAPTAIN RILEY: Is it sort of pro forma after that that you make a list or are there actually people that don't make a list because of comments?

NANCY DEAN: I do not recall anybody who ever did not make the list because of a comment they made.

CAPTAIN RILEY: So for all practical purposes we're on the list?

NANCY DEAN: Generally, unless you have some good reason you don't think you should. You could comment on it.

CAPTAIN RILEY: No, not me.

NANCY DEAN: But if anybody comments on any of them that's going to hold it up so it doesn't matter. I'm sure somebody will comment somewhere because there was quite a few sites that went on; 10 in California alone.

CAPTAIN BONE: If comments are made on one or two, will those be taken out of this and the rest go on the list or is it all or nothing?

NANCY DEAN: It's generally all or nothing.

DAVID CRISWELL: So each update is handled as a separate group; it's not each site?

NANCY DEAN: Generally,

CAPTAIN JUPIN: Now that I have a packet in front of me. Everybody knows what they have in the packet and so do I. Thank you.

I think the next thing on our agenda is to pass out the 90 percent draft of the permit required work plans.

DeWAYNE RAY: Captain, I explained to each one how big the box was so we were just going to transfer those downstairs to the vehicle.

CAPTAIN JUPIN: And just pass them out to the different people?

DeWAYNE RAY: Yes, sir. Most of the folks already know what they look like except one public member.

CAPTAIN JUPIN: We don't have any up here?

DeWAYNE RAY: No, sir. I can go get a box.

CAPTAIN JUPIN: That's all right.

For those of you who get that, please, we're requesting if it's at all possible to have your comments back within a 60-day period, so that at the end of that 60 days we can get everybody's comments together and then reconvene a TRC meeting within the next 90 days. So probably in the time window of

October is when we're looking at convening the next TRC after you've had this work plan, the 90 percent work plan, that's 60 days for comment. If you'd return them to DeWayne Ray from the Facilities Maintenance Section we'll then compile all those, make a summary, bring the TRC together and go over the work plans kind of a step-by-step process throughout those plans with the comments from everybody and make a concerted decision to move toward and which direction we're headed.

Okay. The last time we met there was some interest for a tour of some of the particular sites that we had. If you'll open your piece of paper and pull out the Table Number One, it's got site specific information, kind of a matrix affair.

What we thought we'd do is--and this is only meant as a brief introduction to what the sites look like here on the air station. If anybody in fact has particular desires to spend more time at any one particular site, by all means we can contact the Facilities Maintenance Section and we'll be glad to allow you as much time as you want to at each individual site if you want to go around to all of them. This is only meant it been a cursory look to take you around and show you the condition from our

viewpoint of the individual sites.

We'll take you to site number one which is the major landfill site up across John Taylor--John Tower road, excuse me, adjacent to the golf course. It's the one that was used in the mid 50's and to '76, and it was a solid waste and sanitary industrial and includes a whole bunch of different kinds of buried hazardous. From there we'll stay on a dirt road that takes you around through the golf course and we'll go to site 15 which is the Pesticide Rinsate Disposal Site. Now, that one is by the golf course area itself. Whenever we were fertilizing and doing those kinds of things with the golf course, we were washing them out, and that particular area is based right there at, the golf course. Then we'll continue down toward the marina and pick up site number eleven which is the North Chevalier Field Disposal Site. Again, that was in the late 30's to early 50's and was an industrial and hazardous waste area that we had on the Chevalier Field Site when it was operational.

From there we'll then go out to Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant and look at the sludge drying beds and the capping evolution that we've done there. The wastewater ~~treatment~~ ponds, the clean closures that have already been accomplished

there and then the additions of the human waste area that we have out there, as well, to give you a feel for what's been going on at the area.

So that's the tour and for those of you who were here for the press conference that we had on the 7th of July, it's the identical tour that we took the cameramen and the paper and the other people around throughout the sites. So if you've already seen that and you don't desire to participate, don't worry, you're not going to hurt my feelings and you can press on and do what your other business requires you to do today.

I'm now open for any other questions that anybody wants to have or any other comments since we are having this recorded for the record. I'd be more than happy to open the table to anybody. From the Florida DER?

(No comments.)

EPA?

(No comments.)

NANCY DEAN: Well, I think we'll probably have some comments on the work plan, but they can come up at the next TRC and give you a chance to look at it in writing first.

CAPTAIN JUPIN: Okay.

JANICE KILGORE: The only thing, is there an overall time schedule that's been identified?

CAPTAIN JUPIN: It's very fluid. The time windows depend on the execution. Like we have now, the federal agreement, once that's signed then we have a certain time window that we have to execute the work plans. Once the work plans are signed, then they go through a public comment period. And, again, that's, what, a hundred and twenty days after the work plan, I believe?

DeWAYNE RAY: Yes, sir. In the work plans there is a targeted time plan of action--milestones listed in the work plans.

JANICE KILGORE: That's the schedule he was talking about?

DeWAYNE RAY: Yes. Like the Captain mentioned, it's a target.

CAPTAIN JUPIN: But during each one of these phases, again, after the federal agreement and during the work plan, we will have the public hearings and so forth for public comment to take on board what is said to make sure that we have the local civilian populous involved in this decision as ~~far~~ as the cleanup around the air station. And, again, depending

on like the listing in Washington, depending on what those comments are, that may delay or accelerate or change or alter and cause us to reconvene to take into account some new decisions or some new laws, if In fact those are enacted, to make sure we're in compliance and this whole thing is done so that later there is, you know, the cradle-to-grave requirement to make sure that everything is taken care of. So I would be less than truthful to say it's going to be a very quick process; it is a long and involved, tedious evolution.

DAVID CRISWELL: That Federal Facilities Agreement that's been mentioned, I think between the EPA and the State and the Navy, it will spell out definite time tables for completion of work plans and completion of reports. It will have a schedule in there for submitting discrete portions of the report. So once that agreement is signed it will pretty much supersede the time lines that you'll see in these work plans and those will be the schedules that we'll have to meet. So those will be negotiated between us and the EPA and the State.

CAPTAIN JUPIN: Tal, anything from the Public Works Center.

CAPTAIN BONE: Nothing.

CAPTAIN RILEY: Nothing.

CAPTAIN JUPIN: Okay. I believe that **takes care of all** of our work **up** here. **For** those of you who don't want to attend the tour, by all means, I thank **you** for your attention and thank you for **your** time today. My pain tolerance for meetings normally run **about** 45 minutes, **so** this could be **a** world's record here. It's only **34** minutes. I appreciate everybody coming and spending the time. We'll meet downstairs. I believe ~~there's~~ a bus to get us on and than we'll start on the tour. Thank **you** very much.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED.)

1200

1200

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF ESCAMBIA

I, SANDRA G. JARRELL, RPR, and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, do hereby certify that on the 25th day of July, 1989, I appeared at the Technical Review Committee Meeting at NAS Pensacola, Florida; that the foregoing proceedings were taken by me stenographically and transcribed as it now appears on the pages hereto attached;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this the 9th day of August, 1989.

*Sandra G. Jarrell*

SANDRA G. JARRELL, RPR  
Notary Public, State of Florida  
My commission expires: March 23, 1991.

552160