

32501.000
13.03.00.0007
N00204.AR.000287
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

**MINUTES OF THE FIFTH
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
July 30, 1991**

October 1991

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.

316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32501, TEL. (904) 435-8925
International Specialists in the Environment

recycled paper

The fifth Technical Review Committee meeting was held on July 30, 1991, in Building 1754 at the Naval Air Station (NAS) Pensacola, Florida and commenced at 1:05 p.m. The attendees of the meeting were:

Captain Richard J. Burns	- Commanding Officer (CO) NAS Pensacola;
Captain Robert Jordan	- CO Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), NAS Pensacola;
Suzanne Sanborn	- U.S. Navy Southern Division (South Div), Charleston;
Frank Stuart	- NADEP, NAS Pensacola;
Daniel Ast	- NADEP, NAS Pensacola;
Ed Gill	- NADEP, NAS Pensacola;
Chris McAdams	- NADEP, NAS Pensacola;
Danny Freeman	- NADEP, NAS Pensacola;
Mark Spitznagel	- NADEP, NAS Pensacola;
J.B. McKamey	- NAS Pensacola Public Affairs;
Ron Joyner	- NAS Pensacola;
DeWayne Ray	- NAS Pensacola;
John Roloff	- Naval Supply Center (NSC), NAS Pensacola;
Winifred Shaw	- NSC, NAS Pensacola;
Greg Campbell	- Public Works Center (PWC), NAS Pensacola;
Michelle Glenn	- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region IV, Atlanta;
Allison Drew	- EPA, Region IV, Atlanta;
Doug Barr	- Northwest Florida Water Management District, Tallahassee;
Tim Bahr	- Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER), Pensacola;
Eric Nuzie	- FDER, Tallahassee
Jorge Caspary	- FDER, Tallahassee

Lynn Griffin	- FDER, Natural Resources Section, Tallahassee;
John Hitchell	- Florida Department of Natural Resources (FDNR), Tallahassee;
Jay Field	- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOM), Seattle;
Michael Harden	- Escambia County Civil Defense, Pensacola;
Jerry Coling	- University of West Florida, Pensacola;
Rick Rudy	- Ecology & Environment, Inc. (E & E), Tallahassee;
John Barksdale	- E & E, Pensacola;
Brian Caldwell	- E & E, Pensacola.

Capt. Burns began the meeting by introducing himself and discussing the purpose of the meeting. He also stated that NAS Pensacola Industrial Complex won the Secretary of the Navy Environmental Quality Award for this year. He then turned the meeting over to Ron Joyner.

Hr. Joyner asked that everyone attending the meeting introduce themselves. Introductions followed. Hr. Joyner thanked everyone for attending and stated that if anyone had comments or wanted to ask questions for them to feel free to do so. He then introduced John Hitchell.

Hr. Hitchell began commenting on the responsibilities of the Natural Resource Trustees by stating that, under Section 311 of the Clean Water Act, the President has authorized the state and federal governments to recover any costs relating to the replacement or restoration of natural resources. He continued stating that these responsibilities are also defined under CERCLA in Section 107. Hr. Hitchell then identified the list of the federal departments which are considered the trustees for natural resources by the President. These are: 1) Department of Interior, 2) Department of Commerce, 3) Department of Energy, 4)

Department of Agriculture, and 5) Department of Defense. He continued saying the state departments which are considered the trustees for natural resources by the governor are as follows: 1) Department of Natural Resources, and 2) Department of Environmental Regulation. He then detailed the various responsibilities of each department under Section 311 of the Clean Water Act and Section 107 of CERCLA.

Lynn Griffin (FDER Natural Resource Section) emphasized that, regarding remedial work, FDER wished to work with FDNR and EPA to take care of any liability. Ms. Griffin continued saying that she and John Mitchell are in two different areas and that each of them would need to receive copies of any documents released regarding the work that is being performed.

Mr. Joyner then introduced John Barksdale.

Mr. Barksdale began stating that he would go over the handouts given to each member. Mr. Barksdale then summarized the Phase I investigation results for Batch 1 sites. These results include the affected media, analytes detected, and the recommendations for additional work on Group A (Site 1), Group B (Sites 11, 12, and 26), Group C (Sites 2, 13, and 14), Group D (Sites 15 and 24), and Group E (Site 30). He then continued with the progress status for the Phase I investigation of Batch 2 sites which includes Groups F, G, J, K, M, and N. On March 26, 1991, E & E began the aerial photograph and data analysis and prepared for mobilization. Site reconnaissance, existing well evaluation and resampling, habitat/biota surveys, and grid layout began April 15, 1991. On April 29, 1991, E & E started the surface emissions, radiation, and geophysical surveys and, on May 6, 1991, the soil gas and soil headspace surveys began. Early in June 1991, data analysis was performed to determine if there was a need for readjusting previously determined sampling locations based on the completed tasks. Temporary well installation, soil/groundwater sampling and hydrologic assessments began on June 17, 1991. The tasks remaining to be completed are well installation and sampling, hydrologic assessments, and the preparation of interim data reports. The first of the data reports are due to South

Div at the end of October 1991.

Capt. Burns commented that it appears that contamination is being found on sites that had previously been thought not to have that particular type of contamination. He continued by asking why these types of contaminants are being found, and if they could be present indiscriminately in any given area of the base.

Hr. Barksdale answered yes. He continued stating that this topic has been previously discussed with South Div, and it was believed that contamination or certain types of contamination would probably be found on some sites which were not previously thought to be contaminated. He continued saying that it had been decided by South Div that the investigation of unanticipated Contamination would be included in the Phase II recommendations.

Rick Rudy stated that it should also be noted that many samples on several sites showed no evidence of contamination.

Mr. Barksdale agreed.

Hark Spitznagel asked if and when background samples were taken.

Hr. Barksdale answered that although background samples were not specifically collected, there was generally a great deal of information available concerning background soil and groundwater quality due to the large number and aerial extent of samples collected. He continued stating however, that given that the lateral extent of contamination on any given site was unknown, it would have been difficult to determine where a background sample should have been collected.

Hr. Spitznagel asked exactly what are the samples being compared against as a baseline.

Hr. Barksdale answered that for soil and sediment it will be necessary to conduct baseline risk assessments in order to establish guidance

levels to compare these samples to in deciding if the contamination is a problem. Groundwater samples are generally compared to drinking water standards.

Capt. Burns asked if a site is found to have a greater than minimal human health risk based on the risk assessment, does it mean that the site will be closed or have restricted access.

Mr. Barksdale answered that it becomes a possibility.

Michelle Glenn commented that this decision would be a risk management decision based on the specific site situation.

Mr. Barksdale expanded by saying that on a base like this where industrial activities have been performed over a long period of time, the potential exists for small amounts of these contaminants to be found almost anywhere. He continued saying that the objective has been to identify areas with higher potentials to have problems and to deal with them.

Mr. Rudy asked Mr. Barksdale to state what, in his opinion, were some of the most problematic sites.

Mr. Barksdale answered that Site 11 had extremely high levels of some contaminants, even at the screening level, and would be a problem. Also, parts of Site 30 associated with a small drainage stream exhibit sediment contamination and will have to be addressed as part of an ecological risk assessment.

Ms. Glenn commented that the ecological risk assessment will focus on public health threat as well as environmental impact and will be included in the baseline risk assessment.

Robert Jordan asked if, from the preliminary data, a determination can be made whether the contamination is from an old or an on-going operation.

Mr. Barksdale answered that most of the contamination appears to be a result of old activities. He continued saying that Site 11 contamination is attributed to the landfill activities in the 1950s and will need to be one of the first sites to be addressed due to the potential contamination of nearby surface waters. At Site 1, which was the active landfill area in the 1960s and 1970s, several pits were found which contain tar that could be a safety hazard. He continued saying that Site 15 (Pesticide Rinsate Disposal Area) may have pesticide levels which could require removal but that there does not appear to be a wide spread threat.

DeWayne Ray asked what type of metals were detected at Site 15.

Mr. Barksdale answered that arsenic, chromium, and cadmium were detected at Site 15, with arsenic being the metal of main concern. Arsenic is associated with pesticides. He also stated that chromium appears to be wide-spread across the site, which may be attributable to the use of equipment in that area.

Hr. Ray asked when the baseline risk assessments would begin.

Hr. Barksdale answered that risk assessments will be performed during the next phase of work at these sites, and will begin immediately when the initial work starts.

Mr. Ray asked if there were any fenced (restricted access) areas yet.

Mr. Barksdale answered that this is something that is currently under discussion.

Jay Field commented that, in regard to the natural resources implications, detection limits for metals, PCBs, and pesticides are well above those that are needed to define water quality and sediment contamination. He continued saying that he would recommend that these detection limits should be lowered for the baseline risk assessment.

Hr. Barksdale responded saying that the screening was not designed to be used for risk assessment but could be used to supplement the other information. He continued saying that although some of the detection limits are higher than those required for risk assessment, the data is primarily intended to be used for screening and not risk assessment purposes. Also, in the recommendations for additional work, analyses will be done according to full CLP protocol, which will use the lowest detection limits which can be achieved.

Mr. Mitchell asked why the Phase I sampling for the next 12 sites is being restricted solely to soil and groundwater.

Hr. Barksdale answered saying these sites were more inland sites and did not require sediment and surface water sampling.

Doug Barr asked if any of the contaminants were detected in the main producing zone of the Sand-and-Gravel Aquifer.

Mr. Barksdale answered saying there are only a few sites that have wells that deep, but on those that do (Sites 1 and 11), only trace amounts were detected.

Mr. Barr asked what type of aquifer tests are being recommended for the sites.

Hr. Barksdale answered that they were recommending specific capacity tests to be conducted toward the latter end of well development, and a recovery test following well development.

Hr. Barr asked if a multi-well test is being conducted at any of these sites.

Hr. Barksdale answered that none of these sites would have a multi-well aquifer test.

Hr. Field asked, in regard to the pesticide sites where elevated mercury levels were detected, if the mercury appeared to be related to the site or to other areas adjacent to the sites.

Hr. Barksdale answered that it is unknown at this time.

Hr. Field asked if mercury testing was performed on all of the wells.

Hr. Barksdale answered that it was part of the TCL analyses, and was only tested for in the existing wells. It was not tested for in the screening analyses.

Hs. Glenn asked if the samples which indicated a high concentration of chromium were also analyzed for hexavalent chromium.

Hr. Barksdale answered saying that he believed that the analysis was for total chromium only and did not differentiate hexavalent chromium.

Hr. Barksdale then gave a slide presentation to the TRC which showed some of the field activities that had been performed during the investigation of the second batch of sites.

Hr. Field asked if the total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons and other contaminants detected on Site 11 near Chevalier Field can be attributed to the on-going activities and what should be done about this.

Hr. Barksdale answered that E & E recommended installing monitoring wells and collecting groundwater and soil samples in that area in order to determine where the contamination is coming from. He continued saying that an oily substance was detected during the Phase I groundwater sampling.

Capt. Burns asked how far down this was detected.

Hr. Barksdale answered that it was on top of the water table which is

about three or four feet down.

Hr. Nuzie stated that the State of Florida has a new sign rule out which may or may not apply here. He continued saying that the main concern is a site like the camping area (Oak Grove Campground) which is open to the public. There are two types of areas that require signs: 1) those with known contamination; and 2) those areas currently being studied.

Greg Campbell asked about the potential hazard for personnel working in the contaminated areas.

Mr. Nuzie answered that this situation pertains more to OSHA requirements than FDER regulations.

Mr. Campbell asked if it would fall under any EPA regulations.

Ms. Glenn answered that it would pertain more to OSHA and NIOSH than EPA.

Mr. Campbell stated that they have people from PWC and the pipe shop working out there and asked if they should go through the 40-hour OSHA hazardous materials training course.

Hs. Glenn answered probably not and that they should talk with OSHA representatives for guidelines regarding what precautions should be taken in those cases.

Mr. Mitchell commented that the perspective of FDNR would be to look not at each individual site but at the base as a whole, and its effect on Bayou Grande and other surrounding areas. He continued saying that the Phase I habitat/biota surveys should give some indication as to the degree of potential concern.

Mr. Joyner asked if a habitat/biota survey had been conducted.

Mr. Barksdale answered yes, it was performed using various techniques

such as core sampling, snorkeling, as well as an extensive literature search and field surveys.

Ms. Glenn stated that the ecological risk assessment may actually require additional types of ecological surveys in the areas as well.

Suzanne Sanborn stated that review comments on the documents needed to be submitted by August 31, 1991, and should be directed to Ron Joyner and/or herself.

Mr. Field asked how much more work will be required for the baseline risk assessments.

Mr. Barksdale answered that because he is not a risk assessment person he could not go into details, but that the risk assessment person would look at the whole situation on-site and how the contamination could potentially affect all aspects of the environment. He continued saying that the risk assessment is very high on the priority list for future work.

Ms. Glenn agreed saying that the EPA has that very high on their priority list also and are stressing it to make sure that the situation is being fully characterized as to its environmental threat especially with the nearby coastal areas and wetlands.

Mr. Field asked how the baseline risk assessment works with the overall ecological assessment. He continued asking if the baseline risk assessment would be the first cut to see where and what type of additional sampling is needed on a site.

Mr. Barksdale responded yes and stated that the ecological study is completely separate from the baseline risk assessment.

Ms. Glenn commented that the ecological and the public health assessment would be tied in the overall risk assessment and the baseline risk assessment is a worst case scenario of the risks involved. She

continued saying that the results of the baseline risk assessment will then be used by the various agencies involved to determine where to go from there.

Capt. Burns stated that he is concerned with the current hazards that have been discussed and that he feels all of the groups concerned need to get together to make some decisions as to what needs to be done. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:11 p.m.