

32501.032
13.05.32.0002

N00204.AR.001088
NAS PENSACOLA
5090.3a

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1996

7:00 TO 9:00 P.M.

PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE, WARRINGTON CAMPUS

BUILDING 3000, AUDITORIUM

5555 WEST HIGHWAY 98

PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

ANCHOR COURT REPORTING

229 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32501
(904) 432-2511
1-800-563-6409

6856 CAROLINE STREET
MILTON, FLORIDA 32570
(904) 623-6207
1-800-563-8574

FAX (904) 432-2302

A P P E A R A N C E S

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD COMMUNITY MEMBERS:

JOHN EARLY
LISA MINSHEW
JESSE RIGBY
JERRY WESTMORELAND

JAY BASSETT, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

JOHN MITCHELL, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION

CAPTAIN TIM THOMSON, COMANDING OFFICER, NAS
PENSACOLA

LT. CMDR. JOE MONACHINO, NAVY CO-CHAIR FOR
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

MICHELE HARRISON, PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE, NAS
PENSACOLA

J. B. MCKAMEY, PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE, NAS PENSACOLA

HARRY WHITE, PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE, NAS PENSACOLA

RON JOYNER, IR PROJECT MANAGER, NAS PENSACOLA

COURT REPORTER:

SUE LYNN GILLHAM
Anchor Court Reporting
229 South Baylen Street
Pensacola, Florida 32501
(904) 432-2511
FAX (904) 432-2302
1-800-563-6409

INDEX OF TRANSCRIPT

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER.....25

SUE LYNN GILLHAN
COURT REPORTER

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CAPTAIN THOMSON: okay I think we've given everybody who is going to come later an opportunity and they didn't show anyway. I'm going to stick with my remarks here; it's for the record.

Good evening For those of you who don't know me, I'm Captain Tim Thomson, Commanding officer of the Naval Air Station, and we're here to review a proposed clean up plan for an environmental site here at the Naval Air Station.

Thank you for coming this evening. The fact that you are here indicates that you are interested in what's going on at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola. Tonight's meeting is a part of a bigger effort to make our environmental program more accessible to the general public.

In fact, in this same room we had our RAB meeting just a little bit earlier, our Restoration Advisory Board meeting, which is a group that comes together to advise us on our efforts as to how we best can meet the needs and the concerns of the community.

1 our installation and restoration clean up.

2 We have five members of the community
3 working with representatives from the
4 Environmental Protection Agency and the
5 Florida Department of Environmental
6 Protection, and of course, the U.S. Navy, all
7 of which to review and comment on
8 environmental actions taking place on my
9 base.

10 Our next board meeting will be on March
11 26th at 5:30 p.m. at NAS Pensacola, Building
12 624. These meetings are open to the public
13 and I encourage the public to attend. This
14 diverse group should make a positive impact
15 on the responsiveness of our clean up
16 program.

17 As unusual and as always, I'm happy to
18 have board members who have stayed with us
19 tonight and I also want to thank John and
20 Lisa, Jesse and Jerry. We appreciate their
21 commitment to this process. And I would also
22 like to thank Mr. Jay Bassett from EPA and
23 Mr. John Mitchell from the Florida Department
24 of Environmental Protection who are here
25 tonight also serving on my board.

1 Tonight's agenda though is a different
2 topic. We're here to talk about the proposed
3 plan for Operable Unit Number 10 which
4 comprises three environmental sites, Sites
5 32, 33 and 35, located on Magazine Point.

6 At this particular site we have reached
7 the stage where a final action has been
8 proposed by the Navy. Tonight we would like
9 to review this plan.

10 Ron Joyner from my environmental division
11 will be here in a moment to provide you
12 information on Operable Unit 10. After his
13 presentation we will take feedback from
14 anyone who has some to offer and open the
15 floor for comments from any of those who
16 would like to make one.

17 At that time if they would not want to
18 make a comment, they can jot their comments
19 down on sheets provided at the table and
20 enter them as they leave the building. Your
21 written comments may be submitted during the
22 comment period tonight and you can drop them
23 in, as I say, or if you like one when you
24 leave.

25 If you need more time to digest tonight's

1 information you make may take the comment
2 sheet home and fill it out at your leisure
3 and mail it in later. There is a forty-five
4 day comment period which ends the 4th of
5 April. So if there are comments to be
6 considered, please speak tonight or have them
7 postmarked on a sheet by no later than April
8 4th.

9 Now I would like to invite Mr. Joyner to
10 come up and talk to us and brief us on
11 Operable Unit 10 and how we intend to proceed
12 at this particular site. Ron.

13 MR. JOYNER: Thanks, Captain. I
14 appreciate that. As Captain Thomsom
15 mentioned, Operable Unit 10 is composed of
16 three sites as located on the northeast
17 corner of the Naval Air station. This is a
18 map of the entire base and you can see Sites
19 32, 33 and 35 located here, just northeast of
20 Chevalier field.

21 The next map that I have is an area that
22 just shows the eastern location or the
23 eastern portion of the base with OU 10 again,
24 north of Chevalier field.

25 As Captain Thomsom mentioned, OU 10 is

1 actually comprised of three sites and these
2 three sites are 32, 33 and 35. Site 32 is
3 the former industrial sludge drying bed.
4 Site 33 is the former waste water treatment
5 plant pond. There were three ponds; the
6 stabilization pond, the polishing pond and
7 the former surge pond.

8 And also Site 35, which is composed of
9 miscellaneous units on the treatment plans,
10 such as the industrial grit chamber, the
11 sludge presses, acid storage tanks and things
12 of this nature.

13 A brief history of the site, in 1941 the
14 waste water treatment plant which was
15 constructed, consisted of an Imhoff tank
16 located north of the present facility. The
17 tank was designed and was to treat only
18 Magazine Point area sewage.

19 The current facility was constructed in
20 1948 to process primarily domestic waste
21 water. The Imhoff tank at the north of the
22 current facility was abandoned at that time.
23 The facility has been upgraded over the
24 years. And in 1971 it was designed to treat
25 both industrial and domestic waste water

1 separately.

2 Prior to 1971 some industrial waste from
3 paving and plating operations were received
4 via the sanitary sewer system on the base.

5 For the Resource Conservation and
6 Recovery Act history of the area or RCRA
7 history, in 1981 the industrial waste
8 treatment surge pond was designated by FDER
9 as a hazardous waste surface impoundment.
10 The reason for that was because the waste
11 water contained high concentrations of
12 organic solvents, phenol and chromium
13 electric plating waste.

14 In January of 1988, FDER issued closure
15 permits for the polishing pond here, Site 33.
16 The polishing pond and the stabilization pond
17 were clean closed. However, the surge pond
18 had to be capped with a clay cap and that
19 occurred in 1989. Also, the industrial
20 sledge drying beds were operated up until
21 1984. They likewise had to be capped. They
22 were capped with an asphalt cap also in 1989.

23 A groundwater treatment system was
24 designed and installed in 1989 or 1986 and
25 actually began operations in February of

1 1987. The ground water was extracted and
2 treated there at the industrial waste water
3 treatment plant.

4 For the CERCLA history, CERCLA is the
5 Comprehensive Environmental Response
6 Compensation Liability Act, also known as
7 super fund. In 1989, NAS Pensacola was added
8 to the super fund list. We have up here that
9 the score was 42.4. You have to have a score
10 of 28.5 to be placed on the list.

11 Now between December of 1992 and October
12 of 1985, EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall performed the
13 remedial investigation at Operable Unit 10 on
14 behalf the Navy. Now the remedial
15 investigation is designed to assess the
16 nature and the extent of any contamination.
17 The field work for the remedial investigation
18 includes installing monitoring wells for
19 sampling groundwater and it also sampled
20 soil, sediment and surface waters at the
21 site.

22 In the final report it identified soil
23 contaminants in four areas that are located
24 here on the map. See Area A, B, C&D. We
25 found elevated contaminants in the soils in

1 these four areas. And you can see this
2 dashed area on the northern portion of the
3 facility shows where ground water
4 contamination was located.

5 Also, in 1994 and 1995, the Imhoff tank
6 that I mentioned earlier was removed. There
7 was 148 tons of hazardous waste removed from
8 the site and there was also about 619 tons of
9 non hazardous soil in construction debris
10 that was removed.

11 We performed some confirmatory samples at
12 the site and those confirmatory samples did
13 not detect any volatile organic compounds,
14 semi-volatile organic compounds or PCVs at
15 the site. There were some metals and
16 pesticide concentrations that were found but
17 they were below the preliminary remedial
18 goals.

19 The next step was to conduct a risk
20 assessment in order to assess risk to human
21 health and the environment of the site. For
22 the current use, which is an industrial
23 facility, there is no risk to the current
24 workers. And in a future use scenario with
25 it being an industrial area, there would be

1 no risk to future site workers, as well.

2 However, if the site was converted to a
3 residential use, which is quite unlikely,
4 there would be unacceptable risks to
5 residents in the area. And although that is
6 unlikely, I mean, you know, a year and a half
7 ago we were flying helicopters at Chevalier
8 field and about a month from now we're going
9 to have the first of several thousand
10 students there, so this is an issue that does
11 need to be addressed.

12 As far as ecological risk for land based
13 plants and animals, there is no risk to
14 those. Being an industrial area you don't
15 have a whole lot of animals at the site. For
16 aquatic risk, those will be addressed in
17 further investigations at Site 40, which is
18 Bayou Grande, Site 41, NAS Pensacola wetlands
19 and Site 42, Pensacola Bay.

20 Now based on the remedial investigation
21 and the risk assessment, a team that's
22 comprised of representatives from EPA, DEP,
23 the Navy and the Navy's contractor
24 EnSafe/Allen & Hoshall, it developed four
25 alternatives.

1 The first alternative is no action at all
2 at the site, cost being minimal, of course.

3 Alternative number two is institutional
4 controls to limit the site to industrial use
5 only and prohibit residential development of
6 the site. We would need to study whether the
7 contaminants that we found in the soil are
8 reaching the ground water. And if that is
9 true, then we would implement alternative
10 four which I will discuss in a moment.

11 If we did find that that was true, the
12 ground water treatment system which is there
13 would have to be modified and used. The cost
14 is expected to be about a hundred and thirty
15 thousand dollars (\$130,000.00).

16 The third alternative would be to cap the
17 four areas I mentioned before. They would be
18 capped with asphalt much in the same way the
19 sludge drawing beds were capped with an
20 asphalt cap. The cost of that would be about
21 a hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars
22 (\$185,000.00)

23 The fourth alternative would be to
24 excavate the four areas that we found soil
25 contamination and remove it, dispose of it

1 off site, and also to conduct samples at the
2 perimeter of the excavation to ensure that
3 the soil was removed. The cost of that would
4 be about two hundred and forty-seven thousand
5 dollars (\$247,000.00).

6 And in comparing the alternatives,
7 alternative number one, the no action
8 alternative, would protect human health and
9 the environment. Again, I would like to
10 stress the industrial use is really not a
11 risk but the potential residential use, it
12 would be a risk, and the alternative number
13 one does not address a way to prevent
14 residential use of the area. It doesn't
15 comply with federal or state requirements.
16 It does not reduce the toxicity and mobility
17 or the volume of contaminants at the site,
18 therefore, the long-term and short-term
19 effectiveness is not addressed. Those are
20 the only bad sides. The good side is, it is
21 easy to implement and doesn't cost a dime.

22 Alternative number two would be
23 institutional controls. It does protect
24 human health in the environment. And again,
25 depending on the results of the disability

1 study, it would reduce toxicity and mobility
2 and volume of the contaminants, the short and
3 long-term effectiveness would be addressed.
4 It's relatively easy to implement and the
5 cost, again, would be a hundred and thirty
6 thousand dollars (\$130,000.00).

7 To cap the site would meet all the
8 requirements, a little bit difficult to
9 implement, and the cost a hundred and
10 eighty-five thousand (\$185,000.00).

11 Alternative number four addresses
12 everything and it is relatively easy to
13 implement. But again, the cost being a
14 hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars
15 (\$147,000.00).

16 The Navy's preferred alternative is
17 alternative number two, the institutional
18 controls. We feel it is protected, it is
19 cost effective and it does meet the goals.
20 What we could do is designate the area in the
21 base master plan for industrial use only and
22 prohibit residential development of the
23 area. Again, we would test to see if the
24 contaminants in the soil are adversely
25 impacting the ground water and if so we would

1 address that issue.

2 I've stated that this is the Navy's
3 preferred alternative. It is not the final
4 selection. The final selection is based on
5 acceptance by the State of Florida and also
6 by USEPA. It also requires public comments
7 to be addressed and public concerns to be
8 addressed. Although this is the Naval Air
9 Station, it is the Pensacola Naval Air
10 Station and we want to make sure that the
11 community's concerns are addressed.

12 As Captain Thomason stated, we have
13 comment sheets located at the desk and also
14 up here at the table. If you have any
15 questions or any comments at all, please feel
16 free to speak up this evening or you can fill
17 them out on the sheet and mail them in to
18 this address.

19 So at this point I would like to open the
20 floor to comments, any questions from the
21 audience. And please remember that the
22 purpose of the meeting is to give you an
23 opportunity to express your thoughts and
24 feelings and also to address your questions
25 about the proposed plan for OU 10. Your

1 comments will be recorded and considered
2 during this last phase of the plan's
3 proposal.

4 We do have a court reporter here tonight
5 whose job it is to get your comments down
6 accurately so that they may be addressed
7 correctly by the decision making team. These
8 comments and their written responses will be
9 made a matter of public record and will be
10 placed in the information repository for
11 public review.

12 For the sake of our reporter, please
13 state your name clearly before you make your
14 comment. And in addition, please limit your
15 time on the floor until everyone has had a
16 chance to speak.

17 So now I would like to open the floor for
18 comments. Yes, sir.

19 MR. RIGBY: Ron Jesse Rigby. It is
20 really a question, I guess, more than a
21 comment. Is it premature to arrive at a
22 decision at this time until *you* know whether
23 or not there is any ground water
24 contamination reaching the bay?

25 MR. JOINER: No, we don't feel that is

1 premature because that will be addressed in
2 the investigation of the other sites. It
3 will be more cost effective to investigate it
4 with Sites 40, 41 and 42 rather than to
5 address it now.

6 MR. RIGBY: I understand the
7 investigation aspect of it and I don't
8 disagree with that, but if, for example, you
9 do find that there is contaminants reaching
10 the bay and the contaminants are come coming
11 from this site, then it would seem that a
12 decision might have to be or might should be
13 re-visited at that time concerning what is
14 the appropriate action at OU 10.

15 If, for example, if you do have
16 groundwater contamination reaching the bay
17 then it would seem that something that would
18 stop the leaching process such as capping or
19 excavation might be more appropriate at that
20 point in time than the alternative you are
21 proposing now.

22 MR. JOYNER: That would be addressed with
23 the leachability study. Yes, Jay.

24 MR. BASSETT: Ground water can be
25 controlled, put a pumping tree in there

1 which, in essence, would contain the ground
2 water plume so the ground water reaching the
3 above ground won't be an issue.

4 I think the investigation for the
5 ecostudy is going to be going back and looked
6 at from contaminants that were previously
7 released, Jay Bassett, from contaminants that
8 had been released on -- has there been an
9 ecological effect on the bay and then we can
10 go back and make the appropriate thing to do
11 at that point.

12 But basically we think that the remedy --
13 the way it looks like the remedy we're
14 looking at is to control any further releases
15 out into the bay if they ever occur.

16 MR. RIGBY: So you are talking about
17 pumping through existing systems to eliminate
18 any potential for ground water discharge of
19 contaminants to the bay.

20 MR. BASSETT: That's correct.

21 MR. RIGBY: And that is something already
22 in place as opposed to part of this plan?

23 MR. BASSBTT: As part of this plan. It
24 is already in place. We're going to expand
25 the existing system to make sure that we've

1 captured the rest of the contaminated
2 groundwater plume, for lack of a better word,
3 and make sure that isn't going anywhere.

4 MR. MITCHELL: John Mitchell with the
5 Department of Environmental Protection.
6 Also, in relation to what Jay was saying
7 about the ground water, it will be handled
8 under the RCRA permit. The current pump and
9 treat system that is in place is under that
10 RCRR permit and it will be expanded within
11 that permit to take care of the other ground
12 water that is already outside of the zone
13 being effected by those recovery walls.

14 MR. RIGBY: I assume that could include
15 even installation of additional recovery
16 wells?

17 MR. MITCHELL: That's correct.

18 MR. BASSETT: Correct.

19 MR. RIGBY: Thank you.

20 MS MINSHEW: Lisa Minshew. You said that
21 it would be okay for industrial users,
22 employees, to be in this area if it's not
23 capped, it will not create any hazard to
24 their health, is that right?

25 MR. JOYNER: That's right.

1 MS MINSHEW: But it would create a hazard
2 to children that were in the area, is that
3 what you said?

4 MR. JOYNER: Potential hazard. I mean,
5 if it was a residential area and there were
6 children going out there with their pails and
7 shovels digging in the dirt, eating the dirt,
8 I have four kids and they have all eaten
9 dirt, two of them still do.

10 MS MINSHEW: So the issue is not just the
11 youth, that they are more susceptible to this
12 danger, but because they would be more
13 involved with the hands-on touching of the
14 dirt?

15 MR. JOYNER: That's right.

16 MS. MINSHEW: So the industrial users,
17 you wouldn't foresee ever having to dig a
18 ditch to put in a drain line or something
19 similar?

20 MR. JOYNER: *Yes.* Actually, that does
21 occur now and that is addressed. And any
22 time any excavation is done in the area, we
23 would have to monitor any work that is done
24 in the area.

25 MS. MINSHEW: So would any of these

1 alternatives that will be part of the
2 proposal to put in some type of safeguard for
3 industrial workers?

4 MR. JOYNER: Yes.

5 MR. MCKAMEY: Could you put the
6 alternative two transparency back up there
7 please.

8 MR. JOYNER: Sure.

9 MR. MCKAMEY: How much money have you
10 spent by the time you reach that point and
11 then if you have to go to alternative four
12 you end up spending really more than two
13 hundred forty-seven thousand (\$247,000.00),
14 is that very expensive that first two or
15 three items?

16 MR. JOYNER: No. He's talking about if
17 we have to implement alternative four will we
18 have to spend a hundred and thirty thousand
19 dollars (\$130,000.00) and then two hundred
20 forty-seven thousand dollars (\$247,000.00).

21 MR. MCKAMEY: Yes.

22 CAPTAIN THOMSON: I think the only way
23 you are going to spend the two forty-seven is
24 if you decided to do alternative four from
25 the get go.

MR. BASSETT: The sampling should not be -- I don't know if that's all for the hundred and thirty thousand, but sampling itself should not be that awfully expensive to do.

And the benefit you gain from it is because when we look at the numbers and when we perceive to be a possible leachability problem, it was very marginally over what we call the PRGs and the screen values. So we feel pretty confident when we go out there and perform some data collections to support that, that indeed it won't be a problem because we feel pretty confident about it. We just don't have the data to say yes it is.

MR. RIGBY: I just want to follow-up to make sure I understand. What you are saying is the potential range for number two is not a hundred and thirty but the potential range is three seventy-seven?

MR. JOYNER: That's correct.

MR. RIGBY: Between one thirty and three seventy-seven?

MR. JOYNER: Yes.

MR. RIGBY: But the base still feels that

1 that is a better potential option than just
2 simply going out and spending two hundred and
3 forty-seven up front and eliminating the
4 problem?

5 MR. JOYNER: Pretty confident that that's
6 the case.

7 MS MINSHEW: One more question. The
8 hundred and thirty then is made up of
9 testing, revising the master plan and
10 updating the current waste water treatment
11 facility?

12 MR. JOYNER: Right. Performing the
13 leachability studies.

14 Any other questions or comments? Well,
15 I do thank you for your comments and your
16 interest and if you didn't speak up tonight
17 and would like to, please use the comment
18 sheet that's on your chair and please make
19 sure that it's mailed by April the 4th. I
20 want to give everybody plenty of time to make
21 comments but we want to proceed with the
22 program in a timely fashion.

23 The comments that we receive April 4 h
24 will be addressed by the partner team, the
25 decision making group, comprised of the

1 Florida Department of Environment Protection,
2 U S Environmental Protection Agency and the
3 U.S. Navy.

4 And if necessary, the plan will be
5 changed to reflect your comments and
6 concerns. In any case, the partner team will
7 respond in writing to all significant
8 comments. These responses will be placed in
9 the information repositories for public
10 review.

11 At this point I would like to turn the
12 meeting back over to Captain Thomson.

13 CAPTAIN THOMSON: I do want to thank you
14 for coming tonight. Again, as always, your
15 interest and input is extremely important to
16 the process here at the Naval Air Station. I
17 want to specifically say to the people here,
18 especially to the RAB, Restoration Advisory
19 Board, that we appreciate your participation
20 in this program to help us perfect the forum
21 and what it is we're trying to accomplish
22 here. And thank you for coming tonight and
23 drive carefully.

24 (Whereupon the meeting was concluded)

25

COURT CERTIFICATE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF ESCAMBIA)

I, Sue Lynn Gillham, Certified
Shorthand Reporter, certify that I was authorized to
and did stenographically report the foregoing
Proceedings and that the transcript is a true and
complete record of my stenographic notes..

Dated this 4th day of March, 1996.

Sue Gillham

SUE LYNN GILLHAM

Certified Shorthand Reporter

SUE LYNN GILLHAM
"Notary Public-State of FL"
My Commission Expires Mar. 21, 1997
CC 270308